

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR

CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

JULY, 1884 OCTOBER, 1884.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CLX.

LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER, LONDON,
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1884.

LONDON : PRINTED BY
S POTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

CONTENTS OF No. 328.

	Page
ART. I.—The Works of Alexander Pope. New edition ; including several hundred unpublished letters and other new materials. Collected in part by the late Right Hon. John Wilson Croker, with Introduction and Notes by Rev. Whitwell Elwin and William John Courthope, M.A. Vols. i., ii., iii., iv., vi., vii., viii. London : 1875–1883,	295
II.—1. Mountain Observatories. By E. C. Pickering. ‘The Observatory,’ No. 78. London : 1883.	
2. The Mount Whitney Expedition. By S. P. Langley. ‘Nature,’ vol. xxvi. London : 1882.	
3. Observations on Mount Etna. By S. P. Langley. ‘The American Journal of Science,’ vol. xx. New-haven : 1880.	
4. An Account of some recent Astronomical Experiments at High Elevations in the Andes. By Ralph Copeland, Ph.D. Reprinted from ‘Copernicus.’ Dublin : 1884,	351
III.—1. Quickborn : Volksleben in plattdeutschen Gedichten ditmarscher Mundart. Von Klaus Groth. Berlin : 1873.	
2. Briefe über Hochdeutsch und Plattdeutsch. Von Dr. Klaus Groth. Kiel : 1858,	377
IV.—Memoirs of an Ex-Minister. An Autobiography, by the Right Hon. the Earl of Malmesbury, G.C.B. 2 vols. 8vo. London : 1884,	393
V.—1. Vingt Années de République Parlementaire au Dix-septième Siècle : Jean de Witt, Grand Pensionnaire de Hollande. Par M. Antonin Lefèvre-Pontalis. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris : 1884.	
2. History of the Administration of John de Witt, Grand Pensionary of Holland. By James Geddes. Vol. i. 1623–1654. 8vo. London : 1879,	424
VI.—1. Histoire des Animaux d’Aristote. Traduite en Français et accompagnée de Notes perpétuelles. Par J. Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire, Membre de l’Institut, Sénateur. 3 vols. 8vo. Paris : 1883.	

2. Aristotle: A Chapter from the History of Science, including Analyses of Aristotle's Scientific Writings. By George Henry Lewes. London: 1864.
 3. Aristotelis de Animalibus Historiæ Libri X. Textum recensuit Jul. Cæs. Scaligeri versionem diligenter recognovit F. G. Schneider. Lipsiæ: 1811, . . . 460
- VII.—1. Ireland in the Seventeenth Century; or, the Irish Massacres of 1641–2. Their Causes and Results. By Mary Hickson. With a Preface by J. A. Froude, M.A. Vols. i. and ii. London: 1884.
2. Cromwell in Ireland; a History of Cromwell's Irish Campaign. By the Rev. Denis Murphy, S.J. With Maps, Plans, and Illustrations. Dublin: 1883, . . . 490
- VIII.—History of China. By Demetrius Charles Boulger. 3 vols. London: 1881–1884, 525
- IX.—Family Memorials. Compiled by Anna W. Merivale. (Printed for private circulation.) 1884, 545
- X.—1. Political Speeches delivered in August and September, 1884, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. Edinburgh: 1884.
2. Speeches delivered in Edinburgh and Dalkeith in September, 1884, by the Right Hon. Sir Stafford Northcote, M.P.
 3. Reform of Parliamentary Business: House of Lords. By W. Rathbone, M.P. London: 1884, 566

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JULY, 1884.

No. CCCXXVII.

ART. I.--*Mémoires et Relations Politiques du Baron de Vitrolles.* Vol. I. Paris: 1884.

THE author of this very interesting book was one of those daring and active spirits, who, though in no sense real leaders of men, and always in an inferior position, have occasionally played an important part in great crises and scenes of history. M. de Vitrolles was an *émigré*, noble, brought up in youth in the camp of Condé, and a passionate hater of the French Revolution; and, though he had a fine intellect, an acute judgement, and much suppleness and force of character, he never freed himself from the prejudices of his class, and he eventually became little more than a prominent figure among the 'King's friends,' who formed the secret council of Charles X. He had no pretence, in a word, to rank among the statesmen, such as they were, who directed the troubled fortunes of France at the Restoration, and during the years that followed. Brilliant and striking as were his parts, he was rather a scene-shifter behind the stage of politics than a conspicuous actor in its eventful drama. Nevertheless this man of device and intrigue had no little weight in the councils of Europe at the memorable era of 1814; and he promoted, with marked effect, the policy which ultimately led to the fall of Napoleon and to the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy. Bold, fearless of danger, cool and clearheaded, it was he who first ventured to carry the murmurs of the plotters of Paris against the Emperor into the camp of the ill-informed allies, and to form a connecting link between Talleyrand and his clique, and the chiefs and ministers of the League of Europe; he was the first Frenchman who revealed to them the weakness, in the very seat of his rule, of the colossus of

genius and renown in war whom they had been unable to overthrow in the field; and he was among the first of the keen-eyed advisers who insisted that, in the existing crisis, France would quickly throw off the yoke of the Empire, and rally around her ancient princes, forlorn and lost as their cause appeared, if the Coalition would but declare for them. M. de Vitrolles too, though an ardent zealot in the faith of absolutism and the divine right of kings, did good service to France and the State by moderating in some degree the violence of the partisans of the Comte d'Artois when that prince entered Paris in 1814; and if his political leanings were never doubtful, he proved the skilful agent of more eminent men in bringing about the well-known compromise between the Senate and the House of Bourbon, of which the Charter was the beneficent fruit. It should be added, moreover, that if he took part in the White Terror of 1815-16, and unfortunately composed the Secret Note which virtually proclaimed that at this period the allied armies were the only support of the tottering throne of Louis XVIII., still M. de Vitrolles was too sagacious, as time rolled on and his experience grew, not to perceive how dangerous to the cause of royalty was the extravagance of the old *émigré* faction; and one of the last acts of his public life was to condemn the famous ordinances of July which precipitated the Revolution of 1830. His attitude, indeed, on this occasion, has been ascribed to dislike of ministers, who seem to have held his talents cheap; yet, courtier and partisan as he was, he read correctly the signs of the time, and the remonstrances he addressed to his unhappy master were doubtless sincere and well-founded alike. Like the great body of the extreme Royalists, M. de Vitrolles possibly had forgotten nothing; but he was too able not to have learned much between 1815 and 1830.

The volume before us is only a part of the memoirs of this remarkable man; but, doubtless, it is the most important part—for it comprises the most striking passages in his life, his negotiations in the allied camp, and his relations with the discontented party of Talleyrand and with the Comte d'Artois. M. Thiers had access to the manuscript of the work, and he borrowed largely from it in the brilliant pages in which he describes the fall of Napoleon; but the contributions of M. de Vitrolles are, as it were, lost in the historian's narrative, and in their fusion with it have been deprived of their original character and attractive freshness. Taken altogether, we have seldom read a more lively and interesting

book; and in some respects we may fairly call it a valuable addition to the domain of history. Its most striking feature certainly is its vivid delineation of the celebrated men with whom the author was brought in contact during the great events of 1814, and its admirable description of their varied natures, of their peculiarities of thought and judgement, of their personal appearance, and of their social qualities. M. de Vitrolles had in a very high degree the faculty of observation and of depicting character; and few writers have placed so clearly before us the figures of Talleyrand—his impassive indolence hiding real insight and pregnant wit; of Alexander—impulsive and noble, but fickle and wanting in moral power; of Metternich—graceful, easy, and bland, but quietly steadfast to a fixed purpose; of Castlereagh—haughty, calm, and determined, but deficient perhaps in adroitness and wisdom. Many other subordinate personages, too, stand out lifelike on the author's canvas; and the narrative abounds in characteristic anecdotes, especially as regards the career of Talleyrand, some of them, we think, being altogether new. As for the purely historical parts of the work, this volume shows with peculiar clearness how utterly hopeless the cause of the Bourbons appeared, even to its own partisans, only a few weeks before it had an easy triumph; it throws fresh light on the train of events which gradually led the reluctant allies to repudiate and dethrone Napoleon; it contains* a few original papers on the Congress, as it was called, of Châtillon, which we do not remember to have seen before; and it gives curious and important details of the negotiations between the Comte d'Artois and the Provisional Government at the Hôtel Florentin. Not the least instructive parts of the book, perhaps, are the reflections of the author himself, and his conversations with the Comte d'Artois on the revolutionary and Napoleonic eras, and on the prospects and duties of the House of Bourbon when about to enter on its long-lost heritage; they show with what ignorant pride of caste the prince and his followers viewed the events which had transformed Europe since 1789; with what unconscious insolence they regarded Frenchmen of all classes and orders outside their own; how they chafed against the accomplished

* The editor of these memoirs has annexed to the work a number of documents, which he describes as 'hitherto unpublished.' This is the case with some of the papers; but others have long ago seen the light. For instance, several of the greatest interest have appeared in the 'Correspondence of Napoleon I.'

facts wrought by the mightiest change in history ; how, in the Paris of 1814, they lived on memories of Coblenz and Versailles. For the rest, the literary merit of this book is great. M. de Vitrolles was skilled in the polished language of the Parisian salons of the eighteenth century, and we are reminded of the generation that worshipped Voltaire by the finish and point of his brilliant sentences.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the first part of the chequered career of M. de Vitrolles. He was born in 1774, and was sprung from a good family of the robe in Dauphiny, which, like that of Montesquieu and other jurists, had the class feelings of the *noblesse* of the sword. Among his kinsmen was the well-known Suffren, one of the few French admirals of the eighteenth century who maintained the honour of their flag on the sea ; and he learned the rudiments of arms from a good-looking sergeant, who, in the wild play of fortune during the years that followed, was to become Prince of Pontecorvo and King of Sweden. He was being trained for civilian life when the Revolution, intense in Dauphiny, overwhelmed his family and destroyed his prospects, and while still in his teens he joined the ranks of the *émigré* army arrayed to take part in the crusade of Europe against the Republic. He served, as we said, in the camp of Condé, fought with some distinction on more than one field, and, in the bitter apprenticeship of defeat and exile, learned, in his own language, to regard the France of the Revolution as ‘ a land of blood overrun by a horde of barbarian savages.’ These feelings, however, did not prevent him from seeking the natal soil after the 18th Brumaire, and welcoming the amnesty which the First Consul, in the first and auspicious part of his reign, offered to the baffled *émigré* faction ; and through the interposition of Napoleon himself, he was placed at the head of one of the local governments, into which Dauphiny had been divided, and afterwards obtained the title of baron, an appanage of the family under the fallen monarchy. The sentiments with which the soldier of Condé accepted these marks of distinction and favour, if scarcely honourable, were those of his order : a French noble was within his right in getting all that he could out of a low usurper ; but he owed no kind of gratitude to Napoleon, and it was not unbecoming to plot against a crowned *parvenu* in the interest of the Anointed of the Lord, and if punished for treason to cry out murder. M. de Vitrolles, however, like most of his fellows, discreetly kept these ideas to himself as long as the Empire remained fortunate ; and it

was not until after Moscow and Leipzig that he began to perceive that the reign of Napoleon was a period of brutal force and fraud, destructive alike to France and to Europe. M. de Vitrolles' sketch of the Imperial régime is charged with the very darkest colours; and it is easy, doubtless, to show how its chief exhausted the power of France abroad, pursued a course of insane ambition, stifled every aspiration of freedom at home, and sapped and perverted the French intellect. Yet, if history assents to this judgement, she will also pronounce that the rule of Napoleon restored order, made France renowned, and founded institutions that still flourish, and its extravagant tyranny was largely due to the circumstances of the age and to the national character. The despotism of the Empire was the natural growth of the rank corruption of the ancient régime, and of the mad anarchy of 1793-4; it was hailed by a race that has always preferred strong government to political freedom; and as long as it spread from Lübeck to Rome, and made France the dominant State of the Continent, it was the admiration and glory of Frenchmen.

The disasters of 1813 made M. de Vitrolles prick up his ears, and mutter complaints against the Empire. These, at first, were the mere whispers of salons, but they grew louder and more distinct when the hosts of Europe had invaded France. The partisans, however, of the House of Bourbon were scattered, timid, and ignorant of affairs; and M. de Vitrolles, who took the lead in plotting on behalf of the royal family, had to seek for assistance in a different quarter. The friendship of a great lady of the old régime made him intimate with two or three personages, who had served the Empire, but disliked Napoleon; and a conspiracy against the Imperial Government, already shaken in public opinion, began gradually to take a definite shape. Talleyrand was the chief of this secret intrigue: he had feared and hated Napoleon for years and, vulture-like, now scented his fall; and whatever may be thought of the honour of a man who still served the master he sought to destroy, it must be remembered that he had long ceased to direct the foreign affairs of France, and that he had disapproved of the Emperor's wildest schemes of conquest. Yet personal animosity, it is not improbable, had much to do with his present attitude; before Napoleon had left the capital to take the command of his retreating armies, he had had a scene of violence with his imperious master; and the following very characteristic anecdote shows what outrages even a man

like Talleyrand had to endure from one who could subdue a continent, yet failed sometimes to conquer a ferocious temper. Napoleon, probably without the slightest cause, had suspected Talleyrand of abetting Austria in the abortive rising of 1809.

‘The Emperor, in his passion, broke from all restraints; he ordered M. de Talleyrand to the Tuileries, accused him of every kind of villany, treachery, and crime, and declared that he regretted he had not had him hanged over the gratings of the Carrousel.

‘“But,” he exclaimed, “there is yet time!” This was spoken in so loud a voice that it was heard through the adjoining rooms.

‘M. de Talleyrand, not only apparently, but really, and in all his being, impassive, had fallen back by degrees, and was leaning against the wall, as if he was seeking shelter from a pelting storm; he did not utter a word, and was wholly unmoved. In the midst of his outrageous extravagance Bonaparte cried out, as a proof of his minister’s treason: “You actually did not tell me that the Duc de San Carlos was the paramour of your wife!”

‘At these words M. de Talleyrand recovered his astonishing presence of mind and wit.

‘“In truth, Sire,” he replied, “I did not think that a story of the kind could promote the glory of your Majesty or my own!”’

At the crisis of 1814 Napoleon utterly distrusted Talleyrand. We quote from one of his letters to Joseph: ‘I tell you again, have no faith in that man. I have known what he is these sixteen years; I have been kind to him; but he is the bitterest enemy of my house, since it has been abandoned by Fortune.’

Another of the plotters was the Duc de Dalberg, a German noble of the highest rank, and from youth intimate with M. de Vitrolles. The Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine had lavished honours and wealth on the Duke; but he had not gained the allegiance of one of the high-born reformers of that singular age. In his case, probably, as in that of Talleyrand, Napoleon’s insolence had made an enemy. About January 1, 1814, the Duchesse de Dalberg, a lady of honour of the empress, went to pay her respects to her, on the return of the new year; Bonaparte, walking up to her, addressed her in the most brutal language on account of what he called the bad sentiments of her husband.’

The Abbé de Pradt was the third figure of mark. He had been in disgrace since his mission to Poland; and he, too, had felt the sting of Napoleon’s tongue. The well-known conversation, during the flight from Warsaw, had, it would appear, the following supplement: ‘While the Archbishop

'was making these impertinent remarks, Bonaparte took a pencil, as if to write an order, and put a paper in Caulaincourt's hand with the words "Deliver me from this rascal."'

At this juncture the allies were ignorant of the real state of the tottering Empire, and were perfectly ready to treat with Napoleon. This did not suit the purpose of Talleyrand, who felt that his safety lay in the fall of his master, and proposed to send an emissary into the allied camp, to explain the real position of affairs. "'Europe," he said, "does not understand the situation. . . . They are negotiating with a man whom they ought to crush, and just when they have the power to crush him. He is more able than they; peace will be made, and what then will become of us? At any risk the allied Sovereigns must be made acquainted with the true state of France."'

But though Talleyrand was willing to overthrow Napoleon, he was not yet ready to declare for the Bourbons. 'He seemed to feel alarm when the cause of the Restoration was spoken of.' "'How would they feel towards us?'" he said 'in a loud voice.' "'Ay, and have they forgotten the mass of July the 14th?'" said Abbé Louis more openly.' At this moment, in fact, the Bourbons had scarcely a single avowed and important supporter:—"I spoke to the Comte Montilivault, an old *émigré* comrade, of the return of our princes as a possible contingency: he appeared as much surprised as if I had talked of the resurrection of Louis XIV., and he looked anxiously at me, as though I had lost my senses. 'This was in February, 1814.'

M. de Vitrolles, earnest, and bold to a fault, offered to undertake the perilous mission. Characteristically, Talleyrand, whose suggestion it was, refused to accredit his envoy in any way:—

'It was in vain that he had been requested to write a line, however insignificant, to give a seal with his arms, or even a vague message, from which his knowledge or approval of my journey could be inferred. . . . "You do not understand that monkey," said Dalberg: "he would not risk the burning of the tip of his paw, though all the chestnuts were to fall to his share."'

Having been furnished with private tokens, to make him known to one or two of the allies' ministers, M. de Vitrolles left Paris early in March, 1814. This was the aspect of the excited capital, already sick of Napoleon's rule, but fluctuating between the emotions roused by Champaubert, Montmirail, and Montereau, and the dread of disaster already imminent:—

‘Paris had a singular appearance. Here and there the streets were crowded with peasants, who were seeking refuge in the city with their carts, their oxen, and their most precious effects; here and there columns of prisoners of war were seen on the march. They were there in all kinds of uniforms, of all nations, of every tongue. They multiplied their numbers before the populace; they were made to move in every direction, and to go from one end of the capital to the other; at the same time many isolated soldiers were to be met with; and there were bodies of conscripts in such a state of want that they begged alms from the passers-by.’

Having threaded the lines of the contending armies, and fallen in with an Austrian vedette, which escorted him on his dangerous way, M. de Vitrolles found himself safe at Châtillon. He cleverly managed to introduce himself to Stadion, of all the allied statesmen perhaps the one who disliked Napoleon most; and, having satisfied himself of the stranger’s purpose, the minister spoke to him without reserve. At this moment the astonishing success of Napoleon in the plains of Champagne had as yet been balanced by scarcely a reverse; the army of Blücher had been driven back, routed, from the approaches to Paris to the sources of the Marne; that of Schwartzenberg had suffered defeat on the Seine; and the invaders who, a few days previously, had been moving confidently upon the capital of France, had been compelled to sue for an armistice, and were in full retreat with their discomfited hosts.

Yet—very different from what had been witnessed in 1792-3-4—these disasters did not shake the allies; and whatever alarm was felt in their camp, steady resolution presided in their counsels: Stadion, clearheaded and free from illusions, understood the military situation much better than the victorious Emperor.

“We have had the mischances of all coalitions,” said the Austrian minister, “and the difficulties inherent in, and resulting from, the movements of our immense armies, the presence of sovereigns not always in accord with each other, and the secret jealousies of commanders not in due subordination from their very position. These differences had twice caused the separation of the invading forces. Blücher, eager and bold, as the chief of a vanguard, could not endure the presence of Prince Schwartzenberg, the commander-in-chief of the allied armies. The independence of the Prussian marshal has been more than once upheld by the king and the Emperor Alexander. But it was not against such an antagonist as the great captain that such a game could be played and an opportunity afforded to his daring manœuvres. His army is, in his hand, as though it were his sword; and thus he has struck Blücher’s forces a series of weighty blows, and compelled us to retreat

to Langres. 'The Prussian marshal, without troubling himself about our retreat, has pushed on towards Paris, and you may have heard the sound of his cannon. He thus gave Napoleon an opportunity of dealing on the rear of his enemy's army those skilful and decisive strokes by which, more than once, he has destroyed a kingdom in one day. But Blücher has obtained * large reinforcements; he is at present in strong positions behind the Aisne, at Laon, at Rheims, and at Soissons; and he is about to throw, if not a decisive, certainly a considerable weight into the balance of fortune.'"

Contrast with this sober and well-founded view the arrogant boasting of the self-deceiving Emperor, intoxicated with the fumes of victory, and over-confident, as he always was, from Montenotte to Marengo and Waterloo. We quote a few words from his correspondence at this time:—

'The exploits of my Old Guard can only be compared to the romances of chivalry and to the deeds of those knights who, thanks to their armour and their horsemanship, were singly matches for three or four hundred men. . . . I have taken thirty or forty thousand prisoners, two hundred pieces of cannon, and many generals, and have annihilated several armies almost without striking a blow. . . . These poor wretches of Austrians fall on their knees at the first check. . . . The enemy is in a very different position from that which he was in when he offered the conditions of Frankfort; it is all but certain that only a small part of his forces will return across our frontiers. His cavalry is worn out and down, his infantry is tired of its movements and countermovements; in a word, he is completely demoralised.'

As Stadion observed, the real consequence—besides the reinforcements despatched to Blücher—of the reverses upon the Seine and the Marne, was the negotiation of the Treaty of Chaumont:—

'The defeats of our invading armies had made us perceive that we were liable to reverses, successful as we have been; and as the war might be prolonged in France, and even beyond her frontiers, we felt that it was necessary to strengthen the bonds which united us, and to be able to offer as powerful and enduring a resistance as the occasion required. It was with this object that the allied Cabinets signed, the first of the present month, the Treaty of Chaumont.'

The allies at Châtillon, as is well known, had offered

* These were the corps of Bülow and Winzingerode detached from the army of Bernadotte, through the influence of Lord Castlereagh, and at the instance of Schwartzberg, who declared that without this addition to their forces the allies could not venture to march on Paris. Pasquier tells us that the fearless Englishman at first demurred to this request, pointing out that the allies were still 200,000 strong against Napoleon with not more than 70,000. The reply of the Austrian commander was: 'Milord, vous ne connaissez pas cet homme!'

Napoleon the France of 1790, with large additions, and perhaps with Savoy; but, according to Stadion, they would have conceded more:—

‘Bonaparte, losing his head amidst the din of arms, would not distrust fortune; instead of making on the spot the sacrifices required by the position of affairs, and approaching the proposed terms, he has resolved on defending everything. . . . Had he negotiated on the bases set before him, he would have obtained great concessions on our part, and all would have been settled by this time.’

M. de Vitrolles, through Stadion’s kind offices, managed to obtain audiences, during the next few days, with Metternich, Alexander, and Lord Castlereagh. As in the case of Stadion, it is certainly strange that these great personages should have spoken so openly to an obscure and scarcely accredited envoy, as M. de Vitrolles asserts they did; yet these memoirs bear the impress of truth, and the allies seem to have been sincerely anxious to get genuine information as to the real state of France. It was now nearly the middle of March, and though Napoleon had missed the decisive attack he had aimed at Blücher, on the Aisne, at Soissons, and had been defeated at Laon with heavy loss, and though Bordeaux, at the approach of Wellington, had joyfully welcomed the Duc d’Angoulême, their policy was still to treat with the Emperor. The representatives of Austria, of England, and the Czar were as yet completely in accord in this purpose. Metternich, always opposed to overthrowing order, whatever its embodiment, if once established, condemned a manifesto against Napoleon: ‘International right, ‘universally recognised, forbids us to meddle in such a ‘matter. A State could not violate this principle with ‘impunity: some day, perhaps, the example would justify ‘reprisals; and where, then, would be the peace, nay, the ‘existence, of nations?’

Alexander admitted that it might become impossible, before long, to keep terms with Napoleon, but he rejected as yet the only alternative, the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne.

‘The obstacles which will ever separate the Bourbon princes from the throne of France appear to me insurmountable. They would return embittered by misfortune; and though generous feeling, or a better understanding of facts, should induce them to sacrifice their resentment, they would be unable to restrain those who had suffered through them and for them. The sentiment of the army, of that army so powerful in France, would be against them; the tendency of the coming age would be hostile; the Protestants would fear their return; the spirit of this age is not with them.’

Lord Castlereagh was equally clear and positive :—

‘In England government depended on opinion, and public opinion would not allow any sacrifices to be made for the restoration of the House of France. . . . The cause of the Bourbons was unpopular; scarcely a newspaper could be found to say a word in its favour.’

M. de Vitrolles combated the allies’ views intelligently, and with laudable zeal. He dwelt on the insurrections of Holland and Belgium, and on the protest of the mute Corps Législatif, as evidences that Napoleon was falling; insisted that it was on the field of politics, not of battle, that he could be best assailed; and pledged himself that if the allies would make the cause of the old monarchy their own, and cordially declare for the Bourbon princes, they would detach France from a rule she hated, and, even on her own soil, would be hailed as deliverers. Metternich remarked incredulously :—

‘We have been passing through France,’ were his words, ‘we have been living in France these two months, and nothing like what you speak of has been discovered. We do not perceive in the people among whom we are thrown the sentiments you announce; there seems to be no need of repose, no recollection of the past; there is even no general expression of discontent against the Emperor.’

The reply of M. de Vitrolles was correct, as events were before long to prove; but it was not creditable to the national character, though it illustrates one of its most distinctive features :—

‘For twenty years we have only found safety in submission, absolute and unreserved, to a succession of tyrannies. We suffer and hate in silence, oppressed by that terrible arm which has also weighed you down. Not one bold voice will be raised as long as the popular idea of the power of Bonaparte remains unchanged.’

The arguments of M. de Vitrolles had little weight with statesmen cautious and slow to move, bound too, as yet, by their own proposals. They stirred, however, the fickle and excitable Czar: “I was interrupted by a sudden movement of the Emperor. “It is true,” he exclaimed, contradicting himself completely; “that is what I have said myself a hundred times, but no one would mind me.”’

Alexander, in fact, whether in the field or the closet, was weak, unstable, and without a steady purpose. As Stadion had remarked :—

‘The Emperor of Russia, upon the slightest reverse, gives orders to treat upon any terms; at the first sign of success he will listen to nothing.’

Even at this crisis so little was thought of the Bourbons by

the allies' leaders, that the Comte d'Artois, who had ventured to hover on the skirts of the invading armies, had not received even a sign of notice :—

'I had spoken to Stadion about Monsieur the Comte d'Artois. I had tried to find out if any one had charge of his interests at Châtillon, and if he was corresponding with the prince. He smiled at my simplicity. The name of Monsieur had not even been spoken of. It was thought that he had stayed behind at Bâle . . . but no account was taken of him.'

It was, in fact, Napoleon's suspicious jealousy that had made the allies aware that the Comte was at hand :—

'“The Duc de Vicence,” said M. de Stadion, “is the only person who has ever spoken to me about the Comte. This prince, said the ambassador of Bonaparte, can only be in France with the approbation of the allied sovereigns, and especially with that of Austria. . . . I replied that the prince had no supporters, was not authorised to be in France, and had no political relations with us.”'

M. de Vitrolles' sketches of the historic figures with whom he was thus brought in contact are full of life, and deserve notice. This is his delineation of Metternich :—

'At that time he was about forty-five years old. His figure was pleasing and distinguished, his bearing noble and graceful, his manners attractive, natural, and extremely engaging.'

He thus describes Alexander :—

'The emperor was standing; there was no kind of furniture in the room. I would rather have found him seated. His stature was imposing, but his appearance was not, though it bore the stamp of power. The expression of his features was that of ready kindness.'

This is his sketch of Castlereagh's impressive figure, still remembered by a few of his countrymen :—

'He entered the room, a noble, quiet figure, with the calm and polite manner of distinguished Englishmen. . . . Completely unmoved he listened to me in silence, and with mute attention.'

Meanwhile events of supreme importance had been rapidly changing the allies' purpose, and were leading them, though even yet with reluctance, to break with Napoleon, and to seek the Bourbons. The military situation of the French Emperor, despite his splendid success in Champagne, was visibly becoming all but desperate; he was hemmed in by the immense hosts of his enemies, fully four times more numerous than his own; and Wellington, on the southern frontier, was advancing in triumph along the Garonne. Italy, too, had been lost by the defection of Murat; Eugene was isolated beyond

the Alps ; and Augereau, desertion already in his heart, was scarcely defending the south-eastern provinces ; while Suchet, lingering on the verge of Spain, was abandoning Soult and avoiding Wellington. The Empire, in a word, was quickly breaking up, and, though the capital was still submissive, it was seething with terror and wild discontent. Peace, too, was not to be found at Châtillon ; Napoleon rejected the allies' terms, and endeavoured to treat with Austria alone ; but he was only playing a game to secure a chance to strike hard once more for his Empire. This state of affairs gave increased strength to the arguments of those who, like Pozzo di Borgo, of proved weight in the allied counsels, had been always opposed to a peace with Napoleon ; and M. de Vitrolles and his disclosures were, doubtless, not without real effect, though he has, perhaps, exaggerated his own importance. The Congress was dissolved on the 19th of March, though probably a few days of grace were still left to the dreaded Emperor ; but the rupture permitted the allied ministers to consider seriously the Bourbon cause, and to deal more directly with M. de Vitrolles than had been possible under their recent engagements. They held a conference at Bar-sur-Seine with the stranger, who, as he truly said, was the ' representative of France ' for the time :—

' We seated ourselves round the chimney. M. de Hardenberg, who was very deaf, placed himself next me, on the left ; Count Nesselrode was near him. Lord Castlereagh was on my right, between Prince Metternich and myself. . . . A look of the most engaging kindness was on every face ; and I was at once invited to express my views.'

M. de Vitrolles' suggestions, as may be imagined, were characteristically distinct and compendious. Napoleon was to be pronounced dethroned ; Louis XVIII. was to be placed in his stead ; well-trying supporters of the House of Bourbon were to be asked to form a Royalist army, and the administration of the provinces held by the allies was to be transferred to the Comte d'Artois and his partisans in the name of the King. M. de Vitrolles, too, like a true Frenchman, was not satisfied that France should return to her limits of 1790 or 1792 ; even under a Bourbon she ought to possess the ' natural boundaries ' won by the sword and the doctrines of the devouring Republic, and offered to Napoleon after Leipzig :—

' I had told Stadion that it was impossible, without doing us great wrong, not to leave us all that had been offered to Napoleon, at that period, and even more. This was due to France and to the engagements made at Frankfort. In our hands this would cause no danger to the

peace of Europe. To give less would be to place the royal family in a difficult position.'

The ministers of the allies, we need not say, did not fall in with these extreme views. They considered, indeed, the return of the Bourbons as a contingency to be really thought of, but they declined as yet to declare for them; and, in the first instance at least, they preferred to rely on men of the Empire in disgrace or alienated by Napoleon's despotism:—

"Would there be any objection," I was asked, "to the Abbé de Pradt, the author of the 'Antidote to the Congress of Rastadt'?" No doubt you are acquainted with him?"

"Certainly," I replied, "for a long time, and almost intimately. If it were not a rather treacherous compliment, I would say of him what all the world says—he is not deficient in wit."

"Well," said M. de Metternich, "men of that kind would offer us better guarantees than those who surround your princes."

"Good heavens!" I answered, "the Abbé de Pradt, and many others! Only help us to obtain existence and power, and you will see that more adherents than you care for would flock in."

"But," observed another, "the prejudices of the Bourbons would prevent them from availing themselves of the assistance of men of weight in public opinion, and capable of directing it, such as M. de Talleyrand . . . Fouché?"

"And why not M. de Talleyrand?" I said, a little embarrassed. "You ought to regard him as wholly devoted to that cause, at least in his heart."

"They began to laugh. "Ah, his heart, that is an excellent joke!"

"Well, then, in his thoughts," I replied. Then they asked seriously, "Could one of your princes really like Fouché?"

"Fouché," I exclaimed: "well, that is a hard thing; but still, if he were necessary . . ."

It was finally arranged that, in certain events, the allies would make overtures to the Bourbons, and M. de Vitrolles was permitted to convey this intelligence to the Comte d'Artois. He had certainly fulfilled his mission well; and, though events had powerfully told in his favour, he had a right to assert that he was the first Frenchman who had ventured to open the allies' minds to the essential weakness of Napoleon's power, and to the actual state of opinion in France; and his views had had real weight in their counsels. From the following passage we see that the purpose of the Coalition was still not quite settled:—"I had hoped, after what had been arranged the previous evening, that I might have been able to set off at once, but, to my great annoyance, Prince Metternich detained me, alleging that I must

‘await the result of the battle being then fought at Arcis-sur-Aube.’

These memoirs contain an instructive account of the movements before this remarkable battle, which, in its consequences, hastened the fall of Napoleon. The Emperor, intending to repeat against Schwartzberg, whose forces were scattered between the Aube and the Seine, the manœuvres which, a few weeks before, had proved nearly fatal to Blücher on the Marne, was anticipated by a fortunate chance, and, surprised in turn, was compelled to fight in a situation which ought to have caused his ruin but for the terror his troops and his name still inspired. These details are curious, and illustrate clearly the weakness and the divided counsels which so often made the allies fail:—

‘Prince Schwartzberg was in bed, ill with gout. Uncertain what to do, and believing that Bonaparte was occupied in checking the advance of Blücher, he allowed his army to spread, upon an extended front, on either bank of the Seine. He felt himself so completely secure that he gave no attention to the reports of his lieutenants on his right. . . . The Emperor Alexander, accompanied by Prince Wolkonski, having arrived to visit Prince Schwartzberg, he met General Toll, quartermaster-general.

“What are you doing here?” he exclaimed. “Do you wish to lose all your army?”

“Thank Heaven your Majesty is here,” replied General Toll. “We could not make the commander-in-chief understand the real state of affairs. Your Majesty will now set everything right.”

‘The Emperor Alexander immediately gave orders—these were conveyed by the staff with extreme rapidity—that the different corps of the army should concentrate between Troyes and Pougy, that is, between the Seine and the Aube.’

Napoleon was, in turn, too confident, and was accordingly placed in extreme danger:—

‘Bonaparte, surprised at not having found his antagonist’s columns in full march on the roads to Paris, took it into his head that, alarmed at his approach, they were falling back in retreat. To pursue them was not enough for him; he could only gain the decisive victory, which had become a necessity of his situation, by turning the positions of the hostile masses. . . . He marched eastwards, with the intention of ascending the Aube, if necessary, as far as Bar, in order to threaten Chaumont and the communications of the allied army with the Rhine. He thus advanced as far as Arcis and occupied the town, his only purpose being to dislodge any hostile detachments which might be there. . . . Despising in turn the information which reached him from all sides, and which conveyed the news that his enemy was not retreating, and that Schwartzberg had concentrated his whole force at a short distance, Bonaparte still insisted that the allies were falling back, and

that they should be vigorously attacked on the roads leading to Troyes. . . . He was only undeceived when his guns began to open on the enemy's cavalry, and when the heads of the allied columns were seen converging on the heights above Arcis.'

After the disastrous struggle of Arcis-sur-Aube, Napoleon resolved to carry out the project which, in a few days, involved him in utter ruin—to march rapidly on the Meuse and the Moselle, and, rallying to his army the large garrisons imprisoned in Metz and other fortresses, to descend on the allied rear, and to compel his enemies to accept a battle in a situation like that of Marengo. This movement, marked by his dazzling genius, and promising from a military point of view, nevertheless left Paris without defence, and in the existing state of the capital it was a mistake of the gravest kind, resembling to some extent the fatal march of MacMahon to Sedan in 1870. After some hesitation, the allies determined to march directly, and in force, on Paris, and, abandoning or neglecting their communications for the time, to strike boldly the enemy at the heart.

'The Emperor Alexander had proceeded a long way on the road from Sommepuis to Vitry, where he met the King of Prussia and the commander-in-chief. They immediately dismounted; they went up a hillock on the right of the road by which the emperor had arrived, and, seated on the turf, they made General Toll unfold the map of the theatre of war. The emperor explained very clearly the proposed movement, and, in order to get rid of jealous susceptibilities, attributed the credit to Prince Wolkonski. The king at once expressed his approval, declaring that he had entertained the idea for a long time. The Austrian commander showed some solicitude for his communications, and for the magazines of the army at Chaumont, and added that if they met a reverse, in seeking a victory, what would become of them all? The Czar replied that the loss of magazines would be a small thing compared with a great event which would bring the war at once to an end, and that the communications of the armies would be soon re-established. . . . Prince Schwartzemberg yielded to this reasoning at last; and then the Emperor, rising in a kind of enthusiastic passion, pointed out Paris, and exclaimed, "Let us set off: the safety of us all is there!"'

Intercepted despatches from Marie Louise and Savary, containing alarming accounts of the Government and of the state of Paris, as is well known, confirmed the allies' purpose; and the information given by M. de Vitrolles, corroborated by this decisive evidence, co-operated, doubtless, in the same direction.

The march to Paris brought the campaign of 1814 at once to a close. As M. de Vitrolles, however, has justly remarked, the ultimate result, it is all but certain, must have been the

ruin of Napoleon's power, whatever had been the operations in the field:—‘If the allied armies had not made the advance, they would have combined in pursuing the French army, already harassed, morally enfeebled, and, so to speak, uprooted by its complete separation from Paris. . . . Napoleon was conquered . . . the decree of Fortune had gone out against him.’

This leads us to make a remark or two on the memorable campaign of 1814. In passages of it the transcendent powers of Napoleon were never more grandly shown; the ability with which he availed himself of the obstacles of the Marne and the Seine, and with forces utterly inferior in numbers more than once routed the allied hosts, was worthy of the general of 1796, and is an admirable specimen of skill in war. Nor does it detract in the least from his fame, that his success was in a great measure due to the jealousies and faults of the hostile commanders; nor do we care to point out, with theorists, how he committed several errors of detail; for in the military art, beyond all others, it is difficult to execute and easy to criticise. Nevertheless, if we view the campaign as a whole, and with reference to the entire theatre, we can at once perceive that Napoleon's strategy was out of proportion to his strength in the field; that sound and even rational military projects were sacrificed to political objects; and that as a general he made enormous mistakes. Even after Leipzig his real aim was to strike boldly for his whole Empire; he believed the allies would not venture to invade France in the depth of winter, and that he would have time largely to recruit his armies; and, with these fatal misconceptions, his plan for the campaign must be condemned almost without reserve. His garrisons on the Oder and Vistula were lost; but it was still possible to withdraw into France the powerful forces scattered beyond the Rhine, the Scheldt, the Alps, and the Pyrenees; and had he gathered together these divided masses, and concentrated them behind the Vosges and the Meuse, merely partially defending secondary points—operations wisely proposed by Soult—he would probably have driven the Coalition back, and almost certainly saved the capital. But he would not abandon the Imperial frontier, from Antwerp to Bâle, and from Milan to Perpignan; he left armies spread along this vast circumference, while France, the object of real attack, was defended by a handful of men; and the consequence was that, when the allies, surprising him by their rapid movements, poured across the Rhine in irre-

sistible strength, he had but the shadows of legions to oppose to them, and a mere fragment of his still formidable force was available for the decisive contest waged between Châlons and the roads to Paris. Extraordinary, therefore, as were his exploits in the operations on the Marne and the Seine, he was outgeneralled on the whole in the struggle; he was taught the stern lesson he had so often taught, that the concentration of force on the points where the real prize of victory rests, is the true secret of success in war; and the cause doubtless was, as Charras has said, that in this, as in most of his later campaigns, the 'policy of the Emperor, in 'its ambitious folly, frustrated the marvellous powers of the 'strategist.'

The diplomacy of Napoleon, besides, in this contest with Europe, was wholly different from what his blind worshippers have given out to the world. It has been alleged that he lost his Empire because he would not surrender the 'natural boundaries,' and that he refused to treat on any other bases. This, however, is a complete mistake, as even his garbled correspondence shows; he was willing to accept the France of 1792 after the defeats of Brienne and La Rothière; he withdrew this offer after Montmirail and Montereau, and insisted upon the conditions of Frankfort; and though he held out against other terms at Châtillon, he was ready enough, when Paris had fallen, to recur to what he had at first accepted. In truth—and he is not to be blamed for it—he made his concessions and demands depend on the nature of his military situation; but it is idle to say that he was an heroic martyr who lost a throne for the frontier of the Rhine. His negotiations, too, there is little doubt, were scarcely sincere at any time. The following letter—the full text appears, we believe, for the first time in this book, though the substance has been long ago known—is significant in the highest degree. The writer was Maret, Duc de Bassano:—

'The emperor desires (this was addressed to Caulaincourt) that you shall make no final engagement as to the cession of Antwerp, Mayence, and Alexandria. Should you be compelled to give up these fortresses, his intention is to regulate his conduct by the state of military affairs, even though the treaty should have been ratified. . . . Though the cession should have been actually signed, he is determined not to surrender the three keys of France should the chances of war allow him to do this.'

While the allied armies were being set in motion, M. de Vitrolles had been seeking the Comte d'Artois. That

prince had, a few weeks before, received a commission from Louis XVIII. to do all that he could for Bourbon interests; but, wholly neglected by the Coalition, and treated in France as an unknown exile, he had listlessly wandered in Franche-Comté, and had recently taken refuge in Nancy, dreading the fate of two unhappy partisans who had become victims of Napoleon's wrath. His hopes had fallen to the lowest point when M. de Vitrolles presented himself to him, explained the excited state of Paris, made him aware of the allies' purpose to treat conditionally with the Royal House of France, and boldly declared that the cause of the monarchy was about to triumph over every obstacle. This is M. de Vitrolles' account of their first interview:—

‘The prince approached me with that noble, easy, and gracious manner which simply expressed his nature. . . . When I had placed in his hands the letter of M. de Metternich, which, though not quite explicit, still announced a favourable change in the policy of the Great Powers of Europe, his emotion was intense; tears fell from his eyes; he rose, and, taking my hand, embraced me. “No, my friend,” he exclaimed, “it is not you; it is Providence who has done all this!”’

To outward seeming the Comte d’Artois was a different being from the gay trifler who, years before, had eclipsed his rivals in the frivolities, the waste, and the luxury of Versailles. Age and misfortune had told on him; the butterfly pursuer of light loves had known the chastening of heartfelt sorrows; the brilliant squanderer was a poor exile; the profligate had become a devotee. Yet the character of man never really changes; and while the Comte retained the princely and charming manner of a grand seigneur of the old régime, he had still the levity, the pride of caste, and the blind obstinacy against change and progress which in a bygone age had made him the champion of the extreme pretensions of a failing cause. His conversations with M. de Vitrolles bring clearly out his distinctive qualities, and reveal the Charles X. of the future. The prince, on receiving the allies' message, passed from despair to extravagant hope; and the instant restoration of the House of Bourbon was already an accomplished fact in his mind. Not only, too, was the monarchy to revive: the king ‘was to have his own ‘again.’ Royal and feudal France was to rise in majesty out of the cerements of a temporary grave, and the foolish reforms of Louis XVI. and his age, to which alone the Revolution was due, were, with that hideous farce, to be heard of no more:—

‘“Had not,” he observed, “the States General led to a destructive

National Assembly, and a regicide Convention? The clergy were a respectable order; but why ought they to possess political power? The very Parliaments and their complaints had invariably injured the authority of the Crown, down to the time when they had been the first to sound the tocsin of the Revolution. Were not the Provincial Assemblies the work of Turgot and Necker?"'

M. de Vitrolles, having lived many years in France, saw that notions like these would never do, and continued to hint that the restored monarchy ought to be a régime of a different type. At bottom, indeed, he believed as firmly in absolute royalty as the prince himself: the king was the only true source of power, honour, and even law; his subjects ought to enjoy privileges, but these were to be concessions from him; and the doctrine that Frenchmen had natural rights was a fallacy of the abhorred Revolution, which had covered the land with ashes and blood. There was, nevertheless, a real difference between the views of the two men. M. de Vitrolles, borrowing, unconsciously perhaps, from the ideas of the Imperial régime, wished to invest the monarchy with complete power, and to surround it with institutions antique in spirit; but its chief supporters were to be the men who formed the existing *noblesse* of the sword; and a sort of compromise was to be made with liberty, though this was to be almost illusory. This was his method, as we see, of putting the new wine into the old bottles, and of sewing the new cloth on the old garment, in the France of 1814:—

'You will convene representatives of the great interests of France: States General to be consulted on legislation, and for the imposition of taxes. You will not have a *noblesse* imposing through the dignity of birth and fortune; but ascending to the principle of nobility, you will give the *noblesse* renewed life by associating with it our great military names. . . . It was, too, my favourite theme that the Provincial Assemblies, or Provincial Estates, ought to be the first boon granted by a beneficent Government.'

We notice these views because they explain much that was ere long to occur in France, and show how the Bourbons and their partisans were wholly opposed in thought and sentiment to the great body of the French people. M. de Vitrolles, however, as the allies' envoy, impressed on the Comte d'Artois that it was, for the time, necessary to fall in with the wishes of the Great Powers and to gain the support of Talleyrand and his fellows; and the prince, ready to promise anything, made no demur to the proposed arrangement. With his devoted follower, nevertheless, he indemnified

himself for stooping so low by retailing a number of slanderous anecdotes about the very men who were to aid him in the revolution that was to restore the monarchy; and some of these tales, especially those relating to Talleyrand, are full of interest. The attitude of that singular personage on the occasion of the death of the Duc d'Enghien was, the Comte declared, one of callous indifference, and this, we think, is extremely probable.

'All that can be certainly known is that Talleyrand announced the consummation of this cruel murder with barbarous composure. He was at two in the morning at the house of Madame de Laval, reclining listlessly, as was his habit, in an arm-chair, when he drew his watch from his pocket, and, showing no kind of emotion in his voice or countenance, remarked, "At this moment the last of the Condés has ceased to exist."'

If the following is true, Talleyrand betrayed Napoleon, at Erfurt, in 1808; and his treachery was marked by his wonted skill. We transcribe the story, long as it is, for it is characteristic of the fox-like minister and the Imperial lion whom he cleverly duped:—

'Talleyrand kept on encouraging Bonaparte in his audacious designs because he hated, and wished to be revenged on him. Since treachery was to be employed, he thought it interesting to betray the master who trusted him. Concealing his evil sentiments under the pretext of saving Europe from complete subversion, he set to work. As soon as Bonaparte had confided to him his gigantic projects, he disclosed them to the Emperor Alexander. He pointed out to the Czar the snares hidden under these large and tempting concessions, and all the dangers that awaited him if he was left alone, face to face with so terrible an adversary. To refuse, however, Bonaparte's overtures would only lead him to seek other means of accomplishing the same objects. It was better to appear to accept them, and then to baffle them by occasioning well-concerted incidents that should make them fruitless. This plan was ably conceived; but the touch of genius in it was to throw in a proposal of a marriage—Bonaparte himself with the Grand-Duchess Catherine, sister of the Emperor Alexander. This union might take place or not; it mattered little; but it would give Bonaparte confidence. How could he distrust one who was ready to ally himself with him by such close ties? At all events time could be gained.

'The threads of an intrigue like this were not easy to weave under the eyes of a suspicious master. Happily a woman of talent was on the spot, the Princess of Tour-et-Taxis, who stood well with Alexander, and had been very intimate with M. de Talleyrand. This last personage used to resort to her house repeatedly after midnight, and anything but a political intrigue might have been suspected. The Emperor Alexander, too, visited her occasionally. It was in this secret con-

clave that everything was settled, even to the words that the emperor should use in his interviews with Bonaparte. Whenever Alexander feared that he could not perfectly remember the more important phrases—the decisive words—the princess wrote them out at the dictation of M. de Talleyrand, and the emperor took the writing away to learn them by heart. Thus prepared, his perfidious counsellor encouraged, nay pressed, Napoleon to speak more openly, and assured him that he might expect success.

‘Bonaparte accordingly made his proposals to the Czar. All that was asked was that Alexander should occupy with an army a part of the States of the Austrian monarchy and the north of Prussia. Napoleon took everything else on himself. He was not without reasons to excuse his ambitious enterprises; he acknowledged, nay exaggerated, the difficulties of overcoming the Spaniards. He could not get over these unless he was quite reassured as to the security of his frontiers. The Emperor Alexander, after hearing the expression of these vast conceptions, at first with attention, next with surprise, and at last with a kind of admiration, replied to Napoleon, that “he understood the grandeur of these designs, and that he would willingly join in promoting them, if he could be certain of always having the support of the genius who had formed them. But what would become of him if it came to pass that he should be left alone, in the face of Europe revolutionised in this way? Napoleon could be only immortal in history; he had no successor; none of his brothers were equal to the burden of such an inheritance. But if he had a son, the case would be very different.”

‘Alexander had scarcely finished this interview when Bonaparte sent for his faithful counsellor.

“‘This man is incomprehensible,” he said to M. de Talleyrand; “he has much more insight than we supposed. Do you know what answer he gave me?” And he repeated, word by word, the very phrases dictated the evening before by M. de Talleyrand himself, adding, “He is right; I must have an heir, for my future, my power, requires it—I must!” M. de Talleyrand, with venomous pleasure, breathed these thoughts of arrogance into Bonaparte’s mind. Marriage was spoken of; the divorce of Josephine was not even discussed, it was taken for granted. But when they came to the choice of a wife, M. de Talleyrand at once mentioned the name of the Grand-Duchess Catherine, the elder sister of the Emperor Alexander. Bonaparte interrupted him sharply.

“‘He would not give her to me!”

“‘Not give her to you?” answered Talleyrand. “Who could refuse her to a hero, a genius?” The text was a good one for flattery, and the traitor prepared a well-poisoned cup of it. Passion and trouble agitated Napoleon, and were strongly marked on the muscles of his face.

“‘Well, see Romanzoff,” he said, after a long silence; “sound him, but sound him skilfully. Do not compromise me!” Then, with a flashing glance—“A refusal!” The expression was of such a kind that both were silent for a moment.

“ I go to Romanzoff: never ! ” exclaimed M. de Talleyrand.

“ How then ? ”

“ No, I will not go ! ” Then, after a pause, “ I will go straight to the emperor.”

‘ Overcome by his minister’s confidence and boldness, Napoleon said nothing. Next day the Prince of Beneventum, Vice Grand Elector of the Empire, addressed his master with affected solemnity :—

“ Sir, I have to inform your Majesty that, at noon to-morrow, his Majesty the Czar, Emperor of all the Russias, will be here to propose a marriage between your Majesty and his sister, the Grand Duchess of Russia.”

‘ At these words Napoleon was so little able to contain his exultation, and, if M. de Talleyrand is to be believed, gave such violent expression to it, his thanks and caresses were so exaggerated, that it would be impossible to repeat the language in which he described them. From this time Napoleon’s gigantic projects seemed forgotten; they depended on the birth of an heir, and Alexander had resolved that he would not provide a mother.’

M. de Vitrolles had his fling at the Abbé de Pradt :—

‘ I asked him one day how he had become so versed in military science, a pursuit so opposed to his studies and his profession.

“ It is simple enough,” he replied. “ I spent my youthful days at the château of my father in Auvergne; he was a lieutenant-general; his library was full of books on military affairs, and I devoured them.”

‘ One of my neighbours, to whom I had, in my simplicity, given this explanation of the strategic knowledge of the abbé, said: “ His father a lieutenant-general! Why, he was lieutenant-general of a township; a kind of petty official.” ’

Fouché, it would appear, as far back as the Consulate, had begun those intrigues with the House of Bourbon which gave him such bad eminence in 1815. We doubt, however, if he spoke like this in 1802 :—

“ The First Consul will never give us peace and prosperity. Look at that buffoon; he is going through Belgium in the midst of fêtes and receptions arranged by himself.” Compare this charlatan exhibition with the journey of Louis XVI. to Cherbourg.’

The Comte d’Artois having despatched a message to his brother, at the little Court at Hartwell, gave full powers to M. de Vitrolles to act on behalf of the King of France, and he could not have chosen a more efficient envoy. M. de Vitrolles, in company with some German officers, set off from Nancy on his way to Paris; on the road he met with a series of adventures, which showed his presence of mind and fertility of resource. The party was stopped by a crowd of peasants, guerillas rising against the invaders, and it was

soon captured by a detachment of horse, an advanced guard of Napoleon's army, which, at the news of the allies' march, was hastening back from the eastern provinces and moving on Paris as quickly as possible. M. de Vitrolles cleverly managed to destroy the dangerous papers committed to him—a good many were, he tells us, swallowed—and when brought before the general in command at Chaumont, Piré—a name known in Waterloo story—he contrived to pass himself off as a servant of one of the officers who had travelled with him. Having escaped detection, he was placed in a column of prisoners of war of no importance; but at Troyes he succeeded, with great adroitness, in slipping through the hands of his escort, and, after long and hazardous wanderings, in which he dexterously played all kinds of parts, he made his way safely, at last, to the capital. It was April 3, 1814; and how different was the situation from what it had been a few weeks previously! Paris had fallen after a brief contest; the armies of Europe, led from the steppes of Muscovy and the extremes of Germany, had filled the places of the proud city which had given law, for years, to a vanquished continent; and the hordes of Asia swarmed in the midst of the spot which, for a brief period, had been the seat of a new Empire of the West. Yet even more strange than this portent of war was the revolution which had suddenly broken out in this dominant centre of the opinion of France. Long kept under by an iron hand, Paris had burst into an explosion of wrath against Napoleon and his hated rule, and, with the fickleness often displayed in their annals, the citizens had received their conquerors as armed deliverers, and—their vanity soothed by abundant incense—had greeted them with effusive sympathy. A Provisional Government, formed of the very men who had been conspiring against the Empire, and with Talleyrand as its master spirit, had meanwhile been set up by the allies; and the Senate, only a few days before the servile minister to Napoleon's will, had been invited to proclaim the fall of its vanquished but still dreaded creator, who, having reached Fontainebleau, still awed his foes, though his military strength was almost broken. Order had thus been, for the time, established; and the allies, represented by the Czar, whose promises and flatteries had had great effect, had generously requested France and the capital to pronounce definitively on a government of their choice. The inclination of Paris was not doubtful; the Royalist party, emerging from darkness, vociferously called for the return of the Bourbons; the

great mass of the middle classes leaned visibly to the same cause; and the instinct of the city was, on the whole, true, though its frantic outbreak against its late ruler and every emblem and badge of his power, if characteristic, was base and pitiful. The Provisional Government and the Senate, however, although ready to accept the Monarchy, had no desire to revive despotism in a Bourbon sovereign of the absolute type; they wished to retain the riches and honours they had, many of them, possessed under the fallen Empire; and their purpose was to proclaim Louis XVIII., but with the guarantee of a Constitution to be ratified by him at their bidding. The allied sovereigns, with Alexander at their head, supported generally this resolve, and indeed the Czar with his anti-feudal sympathies still viewed the Bourbon cause with dislike, and had not wholly rejected the notion of a regency under Marie Louise.

M. de Vitrolles had done the allies good service, and was treated, on his return, with distinction. Nesselrode declared that he had 'achieved marvels;' he was caressed and welcomed by the effusive Czar; and Talleyrand lavished on him the delicate flatteries of a consummate master of French compliment. When he was apprised, however, that the restoration of the Bourbons was not even yet certain, and, in any case, that constitutional checks were to be placed on the legitimate king, he vehemently protested against arrangements which he characterised as a breach of faith and an insult to the royalty of France. It was especially intolerable that the rights of the Crown should in any way be curtailed by the people; and had the sovereigns of Europe entered the kingdom to establish the creed of the *contrat social*, and to impose it on a son of St. Louis? This declamation received, besides, important support from public opinion, for the capital had pronounced for the Bourbons, and was beginning to show a marked antipathy to the Senate and the Provisional Government, regarded generally as a knot of intriguers, who were endeavouring, under a mask of patriotism, to secure and promote mere selfish interests. All this troubled the allies a good deal, and more especially perplexed Talleyrand, who, wishing alike to restore the Bourbons, and yet, not without a statesman's purpose, desiring to limit royal pretensions, felt the ground slipping from under his feet, and was in a position of extreme difficulty. M. de Vitrolles describes, with contemptuous sarcasm, the policy of temporising and waiting on events, which the situation and his own temperament caused the

master of crafty intrigue to adopt ; but it was certainly the wisest course, as affairs then stood.

‘The entire policy of the Provisional Government was the *laissez aller* and the *laissez faire* of M. de Talleyrand ; his genius was above devices, and unequal to business. . . . The ministers received no direction, and were satisfied with carrying out mere administrative details. As to M. de Talleyrand, he was like a swimmer, whose sole object is to keep his head above water and to float with the current.’

After warm discussions and some delay, M. de Vitrolles persuaded the allied ministers and Talleyrand to invite the Comte d’Artois to enter Paris and to proclaim the monarchy. It was arranged that the Provisional Government should endeavour to prevent the ugly word ‘Constitution’ from being named by the Senate, and, among other things, that the prince should exercise, in his own name, the authority of the Crown ; but Talleyrand, at least, agreed to these terms with an ample reserve for the chapter of accidents. M. de Vitrolles, charged by the allies to inform the Comte of what had been decided, was about joyfully to set out from Paris, when he was suddenly apprised that the Czar was treating with a deputation of Napoleon’s marshals, in the interest of the King of Rome and a regency, and that everything was again in a state of uncertainty. The conduct of Talleyrand was characteristic in the extreme.

‘An aide-de-camp of Prince Schwartzemberg announced that Marshals Ney and Macdonald, with the Duc de Vicence, had arrived at the outposts, and had asked for an interview with the Emperor of Russia. They were, they added, charged with proposals of Napoleon.

‘Prince Talleyrand, upon this, put into his deepest pocket the letter intended for the Comte d’Artois, and, taking me by the arm, led me into the embrasure of a window.

‘“This is a *circumstance*,” he said, dwelling on the word to denote the gravity of the situation ; “we must see how all this will turn out ; you must not leave Paris yet. The Emperor Alexander has strange moods ; it not for nothing that one is a son of Paul I.”’

M. de Vitrolles asserts that the final resolve of the Czar and the allies was not caused by the memorable defection of the corps of Marmont ; but he is contradicted by all historians.

‘People have attributed to this incident the complete and sudden change in the resolution of Alexander, and his declaration “that nothing remained thenceforward for Napoleon but to abdicate unconditionally.”

‘This, however, was not so. The answer of the emperor was concise—“he was bound to consult his allies.” And, in fact, it was not

until the following day that, after a conference with the King of Prussia and Prince Schwartzberg, the emperor made the envoys from Fontainebleau aware of the definitive answer of the Allied Powers.'

The cause of the Bourbons had triumphed at last, and M. de Vitrolles was allowed to depart. Talleyrand took care to see the envoy off.

'M. de Talleyrand gave me the letter he had withheld. It was short, gracious, vague, and ended with these words, "We, sir, have had glory enough; come and give us peace." . . . "Go quickly, but not too fast; "take care of yourself, and take care of us," he said, with that subtle look which alone sometimes gave point to his words.'

A reminiscence of old times was added:—

' "Ask the Comte d'Artois," he said, "if he recollects the rendezvous "at Marly."

'And he told me that, after the sitting of June 24, 1789, the members of the double minority of the *noblesse*, and of the clergy who, by taking part with the Tiers État, had turned the scale to the popular side, had begun to feel alarm at the growing symptoms of a violent revolution, and that some, whether through conscientious motives or from ambition, were thinking of inclining towards the Court.

'M. de Talleyrand, the Vicomte de Noailles, M. d'Agout, and some others named by him, asked for an audience of the king, but in absolute secrecy. Louis XVI. was then at Marly; it was his last visit to a place abounding in memories, and rich with the grandeur, of Louis XIV. He declined the conference, but authorised the Comte d'Artois to receive them. They arrived mysteriously at midnight, and explained to the prince all the dangers of the situation and the prospects of a revolution, the results of which no one could foretell; but, according to them, there was still time to restrain its course; and the only means were force and a large increase of the royal authority. They sufficiently indicated that they possessed the secret of these expedients, but did not tell enough to enable these to be employed without their assistance. On that condition only they were ready to defend the Crown; they would engage all their influence and popularity in the task, and would accept the risks and chances of the enterprise. At the same time they declared that if the king should refuse to make use of these last means of saving himself, and of resisting a torrent about to overwhelm everything, they would throw themselves into the waters and go along with them wherever they rushed. This was, in a few words, a complete apology for the revolutionary conduct of M. de Talleyrand. All the pleadings of mankind could not have furnished a better excuse for him, especially as the story was confirmed by the Comte d'Artois, who perfectly remembered the facts. It is thus that spiders, in order to spin their webs, find again the threads they had cast to the winds.'

M. de Vitrolles thus describes the appearance of France as he passed through the districts ravaged by the war:—

‘The traces of the war were visible everywhere, and were horrible; the road was blocked with cut-down trees, with broken carriages, with dead horses, and one’s heart was deeply moved at the sight of the stripped corpses. These were seen on the spots where death had found them; sometimes they appeared in ranks of ten or twelve men, fallen in the military formation they had held in life; some were scattered up and down and along the road, so that the carriage-wheels could scarcely keep clear of them. Death had confounded all: Frenchmen and foreigners could not be distinguished; the mud of the roads, stained with blood, marked where they lay, and the corpses were covered with it as they had struggled in their agony. No one thought of burying them; they were devoured by dogs and birds of prey, and the air around was rank with foulness. Desolation was everywhere in the most hideous forms.’

The partisan of the House of Bourbon was not the first to convey the news of coming events to the Comte d’Artois. M. de Vitrolles found the prince, at Nancy, surrounded by faithful companions of the old *noblesse*, and by officers of the allied armies, who had anticipated his joyful intelligence. The extravagant pretensions of the Comte and his race are illustrated in the following anecdote, of a piece with a story told of Louis XVIII. when he had entered the Tuileries a few days afterwards, that he treated Alexander and the King of Prussia as *parvenus* scarcely deserving his notice:—

‘The Duchesse de Courlande, one of the *dévotés* of M. de Talleyrand, had given me this message: “The Emperor Alexander has commissioned me to let you know that no opposition would be made, should “the Duc de Berry ask the hand of the Grand Duchess of Russia, “sister of the Czar.” . . . I informed the Comte of the overtures made by the emperor to establish a bond of union between the two crowns; but he answered lightly, “Bah, my good fellow, we shall see. Just now they will all be running after Berry.”’

After delays torturing to his impatient servant, the Comte set off from Nancy on his way to Paris. When the party arrived at Vitry-le-Français, M. de Vitrolles received an official letter from Talleyrand and the Provisional Government, enclosing the draft of a Constitution voted, a few hours before, by the Senate, and binding the sovereign by a strict compact. The despatch hinted, besides, that the Comte would do well to make concessions on points on which he was believed to be obstinate, and dwelt on the importance of gaining the support of the army and the good will of the capital. M. de Vitrolles sent off an indignant reply complaining of haste and of breach of faith; and he hurried off to Paris to see Talleyrand, and to protest against the

‘impudent acts’ of the Senate. The adroit minister discussed with him the contract made a few days previously, as to the reception to be given to the Comte, and his rights as the representative of the Crown, and he yielded every point with obliging readiness :—

“ So,” I said to M. de Talleyrand, “ Monsieur will make his solemn entry into Paris to-morrow ? ”

“ Certainly,” he replied.

“ You have taken care that horses shall be provided for the prince and his suite, at a distance of half a league from the barrier ? ”

“ That is so,” was his answer.

“ On our side we have faithfully fulfilled our engagements,” and I showed him my uniform as a National Guard, adding “ the dress of Monsieur will be the same as my own.” I did not dwell on the white cockade, but he saw the one that was in my hat. I then continued, negligently—

“ Monsieur is to repair to Notre-Dame, where all the authorities of the city will meet to join in the *Te Deum* ? ”

“ That has been arranged,” said M. de Talleyrand.

“ The prince will proceed from the cathedral to the Tuileries, and will take up his abode there ? ”

“ Quite so,” said my companion; “ everything is prepared for his reception.”

“ Then he will go out and pay a visit to the King of Prussia and the Emperor Alexander ? ”

“ No doubt,” was the reply.

My heart began to beat violently, and I looked at him full in the face, trying to hide my emotion.

“ To-morrow you will carry to the Senate the letters patent appointing the Comte lieutenant-general of the kingdom, in order that they may be solemnly registered ? ” My anxiety did not allow me to say more.

“ M. de Talleyrand answered with perfect calmness, “ Certainly ; that has been fully agreed to.” ”

M. de Vitrolles was not a little astonished when Talleyrand, taking him into an adjoining room, was in a few moments in easy converse with MM. Barthélemy and Barbé de Marbois, two prominent members of the Senate. What followed is very characteristic :—

“ M. de Talleyrand had been repeating to the two senators what had been arranged about the entry of the prince, when, without warning or preparation, he came to the last point, that is, to the letters patent appointing a lieutenant-general of the kingdom, which were to be carried to the Senate and to be registered. I heard M. de Marbois, with his severe judicial figure and wooden head, interrupt the prince with a troubled voice.

“ Why, Prince, you do not reflect ; the Constitution distinctly provides that the king summoned to the throne by the Senate will not be

acknowledged until he shall have signed and sworn to that Constitution. It is evident, therefore, that the Senate cannot verify, register, or even recognise letters patent of the king antecedent to the act that calls him to the throne, and to the execution of obligations under which his power is to be exercised."

"I had kept my eyes open. "There," I said to myself, "is the difficulty I had foreseen; but that proves nothing, except that this great personage knows no more of the matter than I do. No doubt M. de Talleyrand will shut his mouth." Nothing of the kind took place. Without saying a word, without embarrassment, without a sign of surprise, the Prince of Beneventum walked up to me, and, taking me by the button-hole, said—

"You perceive, M. de Vitrolles, that you are in error; the letters patent of the Comte d'Artois cannot be registered or recognised by the Senate."

The Constitution was thus the point on which an agreement appeared impossible, M. de Vitrolles insisting that the Comte d'Artois should be treated as the vicegerent of the Crown, holding office through the royal prerogative, the Senate refusing to admit the title of the king or his delegate to exercise power, save in virtue of a national contract. The Czar, to whom the dispute was referred, maintained the position of the Senate; but M. de Vitrolles stood firm against the master even of thirty legions; and, owing probably to the intrigues of Talleyrand, who felt that the Senate stood ill in public opinion, a compromise was effected at last. It was arranged that the Comte d'Artois should enter Paris, and be acknowledged as the *de facto* head of the State, inconvenient questions as to the nature of his rights and those of the Crown being for the time postponed:—

'The amended draft declared that the Comte d'Artois should be recognised as chief of the Government; but nothing was said as to his rights, or as to the manner in which his power should be delegated and exercised. . . . It was nearly one in the morning when the document was signed: M. de Talleyrand handed me the original with a kind of solemnity in his face.'

M. de Vitrolles, proud of his successful advocacy, left Paris at once to rejoin his master, who had taken up his abode at Livry. The Comte d'Artois, serenely confident in the divinity of the throne, took little notice of what he probably thought was the Senate's impudence; his principal stipulation was that Maury—the champion, in 1789, of Louis XVI., but, of late, one of the usurper's prelates—should not be admitted into his presence. On April 12, 1814, the prince made his entry into Paris, a living image of a royalty of the past, surrounded by its forgotten supporters,

grey-headed *émigrés* and ancient courtiers returning to the city which had risen in madness to immolate his brother and to destroy the monarchy. We shall not attempt to retrace the incidents of a scene often described before, and forming one of the most impressive spectacles ever witnessed on the great stage of history. The prince was hailed with a general acclaim; and, as was finely said, Paris saw in him a pledge of reviving peace and happiness across a dark waste of ruin and bloodshed. But if the exultation truly expressed the joy of a people freed, as was thought, from revolution and uncontrolled despotism, it revealed the weak points in the national character; its sounds fell on the ears of a victorious enemy; its echoes rose from around the Column and the Arches of Triumph; it was the voice of a race that was crying down its own past, and proud years of glory, because it could not endure defeat and misfortune. We quote a few words from M. de Vitrolles' narrative:—

‘We arrived at the gates of Notre-Dame in the midst of this triumph. The prince was received by the clergy; Cardinal Maury was not present. The crowd had forced through all the barriers; the priests who surrounded Monsieur, and the canopy borne over his head, scarcely protected him. As for us, we found it extremely difficult not to be separated from his person. Tossed and driven about here and there, we could scarcely get on. I contrived, however, to reach the chair where Monsieur was seated, and placed myself, standing, behind him. I was pressed by the crowd, and Marshal Ney was jammed against me. The cathedral had never beheld such a concourse. The municipality, the high courts of justice, and the other authorities, had places laid out for them; but these had been invaded; the Senate alone was not there in state. It had done this deliberately, but no one noticed its absence. The *Te Deum* chanted by the clergy was caught up by the audience, and the *Domine salvum fac regem* was sung by thousands of voices.’

The attitude of the Imperial marshals, fresh from the desertion of Fontainebleau, but uncertain as to their future position, was different from that of the shouting crowds; but it was not dignified, and it showed no trace of loyalty or regret for their fallen master.

‘Certain marshals and generals of the Empire—Ney, Marmont, Moncey, Serrurier, Kellermann, &c.—still wore the tricolour in their helmets. Cries of “Vive le Roi” rang out louder and louder at their approach, as if to influence them. They stood in astonishment. Some of them moved their lips; you could not tell whether it was to express approbation or a protest. The face of Marshal Ney, however, was easily read; his features were contracted; flashes of anger seemed to break out from his eyes. He seemed scarcely to keep his hand off his

sword-bilt. Nevertheless he uttered, in the name of his companions in arms, some laboured expressions which he had learned by rote.'

At this point we close our review of the first part of this interesting work. The succeeding volumes—the second of these has been published within the last few weeks—will describe the conduct of M. de Vitrolles on the unsettled question of the Constitution and the restored monarchy; the part he played in 1815–16; his position in the councils of Charles X., and his attitude during the Revolution of July. The book is a contribution of real value to the history of France and even of Europe.

ART. II.—1. *Des Paratonnerres, à Pointes, à Conducteurs et à Raccordements Terrestres Multiples.* Par M. MELSENS, Membre de l'Académie Royale des Sciences de Belgique. Bruxelles: 1877.

2. *Lightning Conductors, their History, Nature, and Mode of Application.* By RICHARD ANDERSON, F.C.S., F.G.S., Member of the Society of Telegraph Engineers. With numerous Illustrations. London: 1879.

3. *Information about Lightning Conductors issued by the Academy of Sciences of France.* Translated by RICHARD ANDERSON, F.C.S., F.G.S. London: 1881.

4. *Report of the Lightning-Rod Conference.* Edited by the Secretary, G. J. SYMONS, F.R.S. London and New York: 1882.

5. *Electricité Statique: Paratonnerres.* Rapport par M. E. ROUSSEAU. Bruxelles: 1882.

6. *Notes et Commentaires sur la question des Paratonnerres.* Par M. MELSENS. Bruxelles: 1882.

7. *The Action of Lightning, and the Means of defending Life and Property from its Effects.* By ARTHUR PARNELL, Major, R.E. London: 1882.

THE first lightning conductor was erected by Benjamin Franklin upon his own house in Philadelphia in 1752. The invention is, therefore, now a little more than one hundred and thirty years old. Franklin was led to the investigations which resulted in its construction by the fortuitous circumstance that about six years previously he had been present at a lecture on electricity delivered in Boston by Dr.

Spence.* In the same year—that is, in 1746—he received a present from Peter Collinson, a member of the Royal Society in London, who was also the agent of the Library Company in Philadelphia, of one of the London electric tubes, and an account of some experiments that had recently been made by Dr. Watson, Martin Folkes, Lord Charles Cavendish, Dr. Bevis, and others of their contemporaries. The idea had already suggested itself to these investigators that the luminous gleam which was elicited from glass tubes when they were rubbed in dark cellars, in performance of the frequently repeated and fashionable experiment of the day, might possibly be of a kindred nature to the lightning of the thunderstorm. In a book describing some ‘physico-mechanical experiments’ that he had made, published in London in 1709, Francis Hawksbee remarked that the luminous flash and crackling sounds produced by rubbing amber were similar to lightning and thunder. In 1720 Stephen Gray, the pensioner of the Charterhouse, so celebrated for his electrical investigations, boldly and uncompromisingly affirmed that ‘if great things ‘might be compared with small,’ the light and sound called forth when glass rods were rubbed were of the same nature as lightning and thunder. Franklin, from the time when the electrical experiments came under his notice, enthusiastically adopted this view. In a letter written to a friend in 1749 he very clearly expressed his reasons for this belief. In this communication he insisted upon the facts that the electric spark gives light like lightning; that the luminous discharge follows a similar crooked track; that this discharge is swift in its motion, is conducted by metals, is accompanied by an explosion when it escapes, rends bodies that it passes through, destroys animal life, melts metals, sets fire to inflammable substances, and causes a smell of sulphur; all of which attributes seemed to him to point to the identity of the phenomena. He also observed that the electric discharge was attracted by points, and stated that he was bent upon ascertaining whether lightning had not the same tendency. In the autumn of the following year he wrote to Mr. Collinson to say that he had satisfied himself in this particular, that he was entirely convinced of the identity of the so-called electricity with lightning, that he believed the damage done by lightning descending from the clouds to the earth might be altogether

* It is, perhaps, worthy of remark that in this lecture the experiments were made by the primitive instrumentality of a glass rod and silk pocket-handkerchief.

prevented by placing iron rods with sharp points upon the summits of buildings, that he intended to test experimentally the soundness of his belief in that matter, and that he hoped other persons would assist him in his labours by following his example. This was virtually the definite forecast of the conductor which Franklin attached to his house in 1752.

In the meantime the suggestion that buildings might be protected from lightning by the use of iron rods with sharp points was incidentally communicated by Mr. Collinson to the editor of the 'Gentleman's Magazine' in London, who, at once perceiving the practical importance of the hint, offered to print an account of Franklin's views in the form of a pamphlet. This offer was accepted, and in the month of May, 1751, a pamphlet was published in London entitled 'New Experiments and Observations on Electricity made at Philadelphia in America by Benjamin Franklin.' The pamphlet was not very warmly received in England, but it was enthusiastically welcomed and appreciated in France. Count de Buffon had it translated into French, and the translation appeared in Paris within four months of the publication of the original pamphlet in England. It was soon afterwards translated into German, Italian, and Latin. The attention of scientific men in Paris was quickly drawn to the method of defence proposed by Franklin, and M. Dalibard, a man of some wealth, undertook to erect the apparatus at his country residence at Marly-la-Ville, some eighteen miles from Paris. The situation of the house was considered to be eminently favourable for the purpose, as the buildings stood some 400 feet above the sea. A lofty wooden scaffold, supporting an iron rod an inch in diameter and eighty feet long, was erected in the garden. The rod was finished at the top by a sharp point of bronzed steel, and it terminated at the bottom, five feet above the ground, in a smaller horizontal rod which ran to a table in a kind of sentry-box, furnished with electrical apparatus. On May 10, when M. Dalibard was himself absent in Paris, the apparatus having been left temporarily in the charge of an old dragoon named Coiffier, a violent storm drifted over the place, and the old dragoon, who was duly instructed for the emergency, went into the sentry-box and presented a metal key, partly covered with silk, to the termination of the rod, and saw a stream of fire burst forth between the rod and the key. The old man sent for the Prior of Marly, who dwelt close by, to witness and confirm his observation, and then started on horseback to Paris, to carry to his master the news of what had occurred. Three days afterwards, that is, on May 13, 1752,

M. Dalibard communicated his own account of the incident to a meeting of the Académie des Sciences, and announced that Franklin's views of the identity of the fire of the storm-cloud with that of the electrical spark had been thus definitely established.

Before the success of M. Dalibard's experiment could be reported in America, however, Franklin had secured his own proof of the identity by the memorable experiment with the kite, so well known to the scientific world. He was anxiously waiting for the erection of the first steeple in Philadelphia for the opportunity which this would afford him for the support of a lofty iron rod, when the happy idea occurred to him to try, in the meantime, upon some suitable occasion, whether he could not contrive to hold up a lightning conductor towards a storm-cloud by means of a kite. On the evening of July 4, that is, fifty-two days after the experiment of M. Dalibard, his kite was raised during a thunderstorm, and, with the help of his son, he drew electric sparks from the rain-saturated string, as the two stood in the shelter of an old cowshed in the outskirts of Philadelphia. He held the kite by a silken cord that was attached to a key at the bottom of the string, and with this arrangement he charged and discharged an ordinary Leyden jar several times in succession. Franklin at first not unnaturally conceived that he had actually drawn the lightning down from the storm-cloud. He was, however, no doubt mistaken in this. The storm-cloud had inductively excited the neighbouring surface of the earth, and what Franklin saw was the electric stream escaping out through the wet string towards the storm-cloud to relieve the tension set up by this induction. It was in the summer of the same year, after the performance of this world-renowned experiment with the kite, that Franklin attached to his house a lightning conductor, which was composed of an iron rod, having a sharp steel point projecting seven or eight feet above the roof, and with its lower end plunged about five feet into the ground.

As a matter of course the new doctrine of Franklin and his allies was not received without considerable opposition. A sharp shock of an earthquake having been experienced in Massachusetts in 1755, this was forthwith attributed to the evil influences of Franklin's lightning-rods. A Boston clergyman preached against them in 1770 as 'impious contrivances' to prevent the execution of the wrath of Heaven.' Even as late as 1826 an engineer in the employment of the British Government recommended that all lightning-rods should be removed from public buildings as dangerous expedients, and

in 1838 the Governor-General and Council of the East India Company ordered that all lightning-rods should be removed from public buildings, arsenals, and powder magazines throughout India, and only became reconciled to their restoration after a large magazine and corning-house, not furnished with a conductor, had been blown up during a storm.

Franklin was so much in earnest in reference to his invention that he sent a friend at his own charge through the principal towns of the New-England States to make known the powers and virtues of the lightning-rod. In the 'Poor Richard' for 1758, a kind of almanac or manual which he was at that time publishing, he gave specific instructions for the erection of his rods. The second conductor which he himself constructed was placed upon the house of Mr. West, a wealthy merchant of Philadelphia. A few months after this had been erected a storm burst over the town, and a flash of lightning was seen to strike the point of the conductor, and to spread itself out as a sheet of flame at its base. It was afterwards found that about two inches and a half of the brass point had been dissipated into the air, and that immediately beneath the metal was melted into the form of an irregular blunt cap. The house, nevertheless, was quite uninjured. The sheet of flame seen at the base of the conductor Franklin correctly ascribed to the ground having been very dry, and to there not having been a sufficiently capacious earth contact under those circumstances. He nevertheless shrewdly, and quite justifiably, assumed that in this case nature had itself pronounced an unmistakeable verdict in favour of his invention.

The controversy concerning the efficacy of lightning-rods continued to agitate the councils of scientific men, notwithstanding this memorable demonstration of their efficiency; but, upon the whole, the new doctrines made their way into the confidence of the intelligent classes of the community. The most important circumstance in connexion with the early fortunes of the invention, perhaps, was the admirable series of reports and instructions which were issued by the French Government between the years 1823 and 1867, and to which Mr. Anderson now once again, and not superfluously, draws public attention in his recent pamphlet entitled 'Information about Lightning Conductors issued by the Academy of Sciences of France.' The first of these reports was drawn up in 1823 by Gay-Lussac, the discoverer of the law of the expansibility of gases, the companion of Humboldt, and the distinguished meteorologist who first ascended four miles and a half into the air in a balloon. The second and the third

were prepared in 1854, and in 1867, by M. Pouillet, the Director of the Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers in Paris, and the author of a well-known work on the elements of experimental physics and meteorology, which has been translated into many languages. These reports, although drawn up by an individual, were the results of the deliberations and experiments of a considerable number of scientific men acting as a commission, and comprising among them such distinguished names as those of Poisson, Fresnel, Becquerel, Duhamel, Fizeau, and Regnault. In the first of these reports, that, namely, of Gay-Lussac, which was adopted by the Academy of Sciences on April 23, 1823, it was premised as a kind of axiom that there are no bodies which do not offer some resistance to the transmission of electricity, and that conductors of small diameter offer more resistance than those which are of the same composition and of larger size. The electrical state was conceived in these investigations as consisting of some kind of matter,—as depending upon molecules which are mutually repulsive, and which therefore tend to separate and disperse themselves through space, and which are only retained upon the surface of solid bodies by the pressure of the atmosphere. When the electric matter escapes, it seeks the earth under its tendency to diffuse itself over the most capacious conductors it can find, selecting the most perfect of them that are within its reach, but dividing itself in proportion to their individual capacities of accommodation, when several conductors of unequal power are open to its transmission. A storm-cloud, hovering above in the air, attracts towards the nearer part of the terrestrial surface an electrical matter of a contrary nature to its own, and drives back into the ground an electrical matter of the same nature as its own. Each prominent part of the ground is therefore, for the time, in a state of electrical tension during the presence of a neighbouring storm-cloud, and becomes a centre of attraction towards which the lightning inclines. When the prominent object is in good connexion with the ground, its electrical matter may shoot forth towards that of the cloud, and make a path between it and the cloud. If the prominent body projects as a sharp point towards the cloud, the escape of the electric matter from it to the cloud becomes very rapid, and the lightning strikes to it from the cloud, from a greater distance. It was further conceived that a good conductor protected from any violent discharge a circular space whose radius was twice the height of the rod. An iron bar three-quarters of an inch square was taken to be of sufficient dimensions for the construction of a

conductor, because no instance had been known of a rod a little in excess of half an inch in diameter having ever been fused or raised to a red-heat by lightning. Even small rods or wires that were dispersed by the passage of lightning had served to convey it to the ground, and had protected surrounding objects from single strokes. Trees were recognised as dangerous to animals taking shelter near their trunks, because they do not convey a lightning discharge with sufficient rapidity to the ground, and because they are worse conductors themselves than animal bodies. But the discharge will not in any case leave a good conductor, well connected with the ground, to strike a living animal placed near its course. The terminal rod of a conductor was ordered to be two and a half inches square at its base, and to taper to a height of twenty or thirty feet above the building, with a needle of platinum, or of copper and silver alloy, at its top. The base of the rod was to be plunged into the ground, and then led away from the building for fifteen feet, being finally turned down into a hole or well fifteen feet deep, and then divided into root-like ramifications, the whole being well packed round with charcoal to protect the metal from rust. In a dry soil the earth contact was to be twice the length of the one which was deemed sufficient in a wet one. It was above all things insisted upon that too great precautions could not be taken to give the lightning a ready passage into the ground, as it was chiefly upon the freedom of this passage that the efficacy of the conductor must depend. A conductor with insufficient earth contact was stigmatised as being not only inefficacious, but dangerous, because it would attract the lightning without being able to convey it to the ground.

It was further asserted in this most comprehensive and notable report that an experience of fifty years had proved buildings to be effectually protected when good conductors were placed on them. In the United States a number of conductors had been known to have been struck, but in not more than two of these cases had the buildings themselves suffered any damage. It was generally assumed from the data then at command that buildings which were protected by lightning-rods were not more likely to have the discharge brought down in their neighbourhood on account of the presence of the rods, and it was also held that, even if they were open to such a liability, this could be of no practical moment, because the power of a conductor to attract the lightning more frequently would, of necessity, also involve the capacity to convey it more freely to the ground. Points were spoken of

as undoubtedly tending to neutralise the tension of a charged cloud. Dr. Rittenhouse was referred to as having observed in Philadelphia that the points of lightning conductors were frequently blunted by fusion without the houses to which they were attached having been in any way injured.

The views advocated in this early code of instructions have been dwelt upon in some detail in order that it may be seen how effectively this document laid down the broad principles of defence which are acted upon even at the present day. This instruction, after it had been stamped with the approval of the Academy of Sciences, became a sort of popular manual under the weight of this sanction. The Government gave force to the instruction by providing that it should have effect in reference to all public buildings and churches. The report also became the chief authority on the subject in most foreign lands. It likewise served the useful purpose of weakening the opposition which still endeavoured to maintain that disastrous explosions were caused by conductors, and furnished clear and precise rules for construction that were intelligible to ordinary workmen.

In the year 1854 iron was much more generally used in buildings than it had been at an earlier date, and some additional knowledge of the conditions and laws of electrical action had been acquired. The Academy on this account thought it well to request the Section of Physics to reconsider the lightning-girded instruction of 1823. This led to the first report, which was prepared by M. Pouillet, adopted by the Academy of Sciences on March 5, 1855, and immediately afterwards issued by the Government as an additional instruction. In this document it was held that the large masses of iron employed in buildings certainly serve to attract the lightning. If two buildings of an equal size were similarly placed, the one being exclusively of stone and wood, and the other having large masses of metal in its construction, the lightning would certainly strike the latter and avoid the former, just as, when a ball of metal and a ball of wood are presented together towards a charged prime conductor of an electrical machine, it is always the former, and never the latter, which receives the spark. A dry soil, it was pointed out, does not attract the lightning. But if under such a soil there occur, at some depth, large masses of metal, or accumulations of water, the lightning would explode through the dry earth, splitting it up as a coat of varnish is pierced by an electric spark. The line of a lightning discharge is always marked out for it beforehand in conformity with the law of electric tension

beginning at the same instant at both the extremities of the track. The objects which are most liable to strokes of lightning are good conductors that project furthest over towards the clouds.

In the report of 1855 the occasion was used to draw attention to some instructive instances of the mechanical effects of lightning discharges which had taken place upon the open sea. In 1827 the packet-boat 'New York,' not at the time carrying a conductor, was struck during its passage across the ocean, and a leaden pipe, three inches in diameter and one inch thick, was fused where the discharge escaped into the sea. A chain of iron wire, one quarter of an inch in diameter and 130 feet long, having been then hoisted up on one of the masts and trailed in the sea, was struck by a second discharge, and scattered into molten molecules and broken fragments, the bridge being set on fire, although at the time covered by a sheet of hail and a deluge of rain. The 'Jupiter,' in the North Sea fleet, in 1854, carrying a chain of several strands of fortieth-of-an-inch brass wire, 260 feet long, hung from the mainmast-head, and trailing seven feet into the sea, was struck, and had the chain scattered into thousands of fragments without any damage being done to the vessel itself. A Turkish ship cruising near at the time, with a chain from the masthead which did not reach into the sea, had a hole like that which would have been made by a cannon-shot pierced through the hull near the water-line. The inference was drawn from these cases that chains, and especially small chains, were not trustworthy for the purpose of conducting discharges of lightning. The mechanical violence sustained was perceived to be due to the circumstance that the conductors provided were of a bad principle of construction. They were at the least from nine to ten times too small. Conductors provided by engineering art are intended to be struck, but struck in such a manner as to govern the lightning, and to render the heaviest strokes harmless. No case had been known of a continuous iron rod, three-quarters of an inch in diameter, or with a sectional area of one and a quarter square inch, having been structurally injured. The cases alluded to were held to demonstrate that conductors must have a sufficient size and thickness of metal, and must be continuous and without defect from end to end. It was definitely settled that, in accordance with these requirements, a square iron rod used as a defence against lightning should have, at least, a diameter of nine-sixteenths of an inch, and that a round rod should have a diameter of ten-sixteenths of an inch.

Some modification was also made in this instruction in reference to air-terminals. It was considered that a blunt point, fashioned like the apex of a cone subtending an angle of thirty degrees, would be less liable to fusion than a sharper and more attenuated point, and that therefore it should be adopted for the upper terminal, although it might, perhaps, not exert altogether so satisfactory a neutralising influence. The area protected by a conductor was now considered not to be so definite and certain as it was previously held to be. It was recognised that it would be less in the case of a building with a metal roof, for instance, than in other circumstances. The earth contact, it was remarked, could not be looked upon as efficacious unless it were made, through the instrumentality of sheets of water, at least as large as the area of the storm-cloud, and access to such sheets must be secured by boring both in the direction of the surface moisture and in that of the deeper soil. Chains of red copper with a square section of three-eighths of an inch, and weighing a pound and three-quarters per yard, were recommended for ships. Such were the principal suggestions of a practical kind that were submitted in this report. In all other particulars the provisions of the earlier instructions were substantially approved and confirmed. There was, however, one incidental remark contained in this excellent report which is deserving of the highest commendation and approval on account of its practical wisdom. This emphasised the necessity for continued and minute observation and study of the effects of thunderstorms, with a view alike to ascertain what it is that lightning spares, as well as what it strikes. It is of the utmost importance for the advance of man's knowledge in this branch of physical investigation that all instances of injury from lightning should be immediately examined and tested, and that all facts ascertained should be accurately described and placed upon record.

In the year 1866 the Minister of War in France became doubtful in regard to the measures which were then taken to secure powder magazines against accident from lightning, and in consequence once again brought the matter formally under the consideration of the Academy of Sciences. It was this action of the Minister which led to the third report, also drawn up by M. Pouillet, adopted by the Academy in the beginning of 1867, and shortly afterwards issued under the authority of the French Government. In this report the best method of making joints in a conductor by overlapping, riveting, and soldering the contiguous ends, was pointed out, and it was urged that the underground continuation of the

rod should be carried on to an adequately moist place, even if miles had to be traversed for the purpose. The increase in the number of air-terminals and the connecting them together were deemed of more consequence than the increasing the height of a smaller number. Secondary terminals were advised for every additional length of thirty-three yards of roof. The expansion of rods by heat was provided for by inserting free semicircular bands of red copper at suitable intervals, four inches of addition to the length being allowed for in every hundred yards of rod.

The example set by France in the preparation of these reports was followed for the first time in England by the appointment of a Naval Commission in 1839 to enquire into the protection of the vessels of the Royal Navy. This Commission was formed in consequence of the public attention which had been drawn to the matter by Snow Harris, who stated that, within the forty years that ended in 1832, 250 vessels had been more or less seriously injured by lightning. The Commission somewhat haltingly reported that there was no harm in lightning conductors, and that it thought the system of protection might be tried. Snow Harris thereupon introduced the plan of nailing a double set of overlapping strips of copper along the masts. After the adoption of this method the conductors were struck by lightning in several instances, but in no case did the vessels suffer any damage. This excellent system was only superseded in the end by the natural result of the introduction of iron vessels, which made the ships themselves efficient conductors in virtue of the principle of their construction. The original idea of Snow Harris was, indeed, to bring the general structure requiring defence as nearly as possible into the same non-resisting state that it would have if entirely composed of metal. He was knighted for his services in 1847, and in 1855 was employed to design the protection of the then new Houses of Parliament at Westminster, which he carried out by a modification of the plan that he had matured for the protection of the vessels of the Royal Navy. Two-inch tubes of copper, connected by solid screw plugs and coupling pieces, were affixed to all the more elevated portions of the building. The sum of 2,314*l.* provided for the execution of this work was memorable as being the first grant made by the English Parliament for the protection of a public building against lightning.

About ten years after the erection of the lightning conductors upon the Houses of Parliament at Westminster, it was found to be desirable to provide a similar protection for

the magnificent old Hôtel de Ville at Brussels, in consequence of some damage having occurred to the principal tower of the building during a thunderstorm. The communal administration of the city had recourse to the Académie Royale des Sciences for advice in the emergency, and a commission, consisting of M. Duprez, M. Liagre, and Professor Melsens, was appointed to give a careful consideration to the matter. Professor Melsens visited Plymouth and London, to consult with Sir W. Snow Harris, and to examine the plan of defence which had been adopted for the Houses of Parliament. Shortly afterwards the Commission at Brussels submitted to the communal administration the famous plan of lightning-defence which has since been carried out at the Hôtel de Ville, and which has been described in the minutest detail in an illustrated work entitled '*Description détaillée des Paratonnerres établis sur l'Hôtel de Ville de Bruxelles,*' and printed in 1865, in explanation of his views, by Professor Melsens himself.

Professor Melsens's method of defence differs in one important particular from the measures which had been recommended in the Paris instructions, and which have been most generally adopted in England. He had for some time been inclined to advocate the use of numerous rods of small size, rather than one dominant rod of more ample dimensions, whenever large buildings with numerous projecting pinnacles and gables were concerned. His view virtually is that the aim in such cases should be to throw a sort of metallic net broad-cast over the building, with salient points carried up into the air at all projecting parts of the structure, and with numerous rootlets plunging down into the conducting mass of the earth beneath; and he contrived an experiment which he was in the habit of exhibiting to his visitors at the laboratory in l'Ecole de Médecine Vétérinaire de l'Etat, which certainly went very far to justify the position he had taken up. He prepared a spherical case or cage of stout iron wire, and having enclosed a small bird in this cage, he passed electric shocks through it from a battery of fifteen very large Leyden jars, without causing either injury or inconvenience to the bird. A couple of little feathered pensioners were maintained at the laboratory for the performance of this experiment, and were subjected to the ordeal a considerable number of times, and there is no doubt could be subjected to it for any number of times, without the remotest chance that they would ever be touched by the terrific discharges that were flashed through the walls of their prison cell in such close propinquity to them. What happened in the case of the birds in this experiment assuredly would happen

also in the case of any building that was encaged in metallic rods in a similar way. No demonstration of a mere physical fact could possibly be more absolute or more complete.

The Hôtel de Ville at Brussels is a large mediæval building, enclosing in its centre an open quadrangular court, and surmounted in the middle of its principal face by an elaborately pinnaced tower, 297 feet high, with a gilt statue of St. Michael at the top, standing upon a prostrate dragon and flourishing a drawn sword above his head. There are four galleries on the spire beneath the statue, and there are also six spire-crowned subordinate turrets, and three parapeted gables projecting above the roof from other parts of the building. The statue of the saint is reared upon a lead-covered cupola or platform, and Professor Melsens determined that the point of its sword should serve as the culminant point of his system of lightning-rods; but he also took the precaution of very largely reinforcing this highest terminal by surrounding the base of the lead-covered platform at the feet of the statue with a *chevaux-de-frise* of outwardly and upwardly branching rods, constituting a radiant circle of tufted points or aigrettes. There were altogether forty-eight of these points projecting round the feet of the statue to a distance of eight feet in all directions. From these radiating aigrettes, and from the statue standing above, a series of eight iron rods were carried down along the face of the tower and the slope of the roof, through an entire length of 310 feet, to the interior courtyard. But as these rods descended along the perpendicular face of the building they were joined by other similar rods from the various subordinate turrets, pinnacles, gables, and ridges, which all had their own systems of terminal points rising up towards the sky. There were altogether 426 points projecting up from the building. An observer looking down from one of the elevated galleries of the spire took in at a glance quite a little forest of spikes bristling up into the air, which were all in direct metallic contact with the main stems of the conductors.

An even more ample provision was made for the connexion of this system of conductors with the ground. The vertical rods were first collected into an iron box fixed about a yard above the ground in the inner court, and filled with molten zinc so as to unite the whole into one continuous block of metal. From the hollow of this box twenty-four iron rods, two-fifths of an inch in diameter, issued, and of these a third part was carried to an iron cylinder sunk in a well, another third was connected with the iron water-mains of the town,

and the remaining third was put into communication in a similar way with the gas-mains. Professor Melsens estimated that the earth contact which was established by this threefold distribution amounted altogether to 333,000 square yards of conducting communication. Iron rods were used in preference to copper in this construction on account of the cost which would have been entailed if copper had been employed for so extensive a work, and also because Professor Melsens had satisfied himself that iron has more tenacity and power of cohesion than copper when exposed to the disintegrating strain of powerful discharges of electricity. He devised a very pretty experimental proof of this, in which the discharge of a large battery of Leyden jars was passed through a fine wire of equal dimensions throughout, but of which one half was composed of copper and the other half of iron. The iron portion was converted into a beaded, but still unbroken, strand by the discharge, but the copper part was scattered into a black impalpable powder. It is scarcely too much to say that the Hôtel de Ville at Brussels at the present day, with its lofty aigrette-defended tower, its forest of points, its network of rods, and its widely ramifying earth roots, is, as far as danger from lightning is concerned, one of the best protected buildings in the world. It may safely be affirmed that it is quite as hard for the lightning to get mischievously at this building, as it is for the discharge of the Leyden battery to get at Professor Melsens' birds when they are enclosed in their iron cage.* In the heaviest of storms Professor Melsens travels about within the meshes of his system of conductors, to investigate their behaviour, with the most perfect *sang froid* and confidence. In 1866 Professor Melsens examined with great care the transmitting capacity of his system of conductors at the Hôtel de Ville, and in this final investigation he employed all the various means that are now at the command of science. He used continuous currents, instantaneous discharges, sparks from the electrical machine, from powerful batteries, and from a large Ruhmkorff coil, and with all he found that the conductivity of his system was practically perfect.

One of the grounds upon which Professor Melsens adopts his system of multiple rods is the circumstance that an electrical discharge diffuses itself through all the branches of a multifold conductor in proportion to the resistance which is offered by each part, and that it does not all concentrate itself

* M. de Fonvielle says of this plan of defence that Professor Melsens does not leave the lightning a gap that it can get through.

into the shortest and most open path. He has devised some very ingenious experiments for proving this position, and has been able to show the sixty-thousandth part of a discharge passing by a very narrow and roundabout path, when a broad and direct one was open, and traversed by the larger proportions of the discharge. He brought this part of his subject under the notice of the Academy of Sciences of Belgium in a special note, which was printed in their 'Bulletins' in 1875.

In the year 1875 the Meteorological Society of London was moved to follow the lead of the French meteorologists in reference to lightning conductors, and to appoint a Lightning-rod Committee. From the report made to the Society by the Council in the following year, it appears that the objects contemplated in this action were 'an investigation and record of 'accidents from lightning, an enquiry into the principles 'involved in the protection of buildings, the diffusion of exact 'information regarding the best form and arrangement for 'lightning conductors, and the consideration of all phenomena 'connected with atmospheric electricity.'* It is obvious that in its first conception this committee was intended to be essentially one of investigation and enquiry, and it was for this reason appropriately designated a 'Permanent Committee.' The meteorologists concerned in its inauguration were actuated by the same consideration that was present to the Section of Physics of the Academy of Sciences in Paris when the following paragraph of the instruction of 1854 was drawn up:—

'One knows, it is true, a very great number of examples of people being killed or of houses being set on fire; one knows, also, many and diverse instances of metals fused, of timber shattered, of stones and even of walls thrown far away, and many other analogous effects; but what is generally wanting is precise measurements relative to distance, dimensions, the position of the object—both that which is struck and that which escaped. For it is necessary to know what the lightning spares, as well as what it strikes. It is the work of all observers, but especially of officers in the navy and artillery, of engineers, of professors, inventors, and architects, to test these phenomena at the moment they are produced, and to describe them accurately for the benefit of science, as well as that of public economy. Such descriptions, when they refer to a stroke of lightning, should as much as possible point out the track of the lightning from its highest to its lowest point; also they should show by sufficiently numerous horizontal sections the relative positions of all objects in a circle wide enough to take in those which have been struck.'

In this passage the instruction of the French Academy no doubt touches the one point which is necessary before all else to improve, if not to perfect, the practice of electrical engineering, so far as this is aimed against the destructive powers of lightning. The broad principles upon which the engineer prosecutes his work are happily such as can be referred to actual experiments carried out by the artificial apparatus of the electrician. But there still remain some incidental questions, such as the influence of surface, extent, and form in conductors, the relation of conductivity to tenacity, the area of protection, and the maximum effect of lightning, which cannot be settled in this way, and which require an appeal to the larger operations of nature. This, however, concerns opportunities which cannot be arranged at will. The method of the appeal must of necessity be observational rather than experimental. It proceeds upon the lines of close watching and systematic record. Observations where the great operations of nature are concerned are utterly worthless unless they are made with scientific insight and precision. The plan of investigation that has to be pursued is therefore to collect an exact account of all accidents that occur, and to arrange a system of organisation which enables all such chance opportunities to be seized upon and improved by an immediate investigation of concomitant conditions and circumstances. This method of study also must be followed up by patient persistence for a considerable length of time, seeing that accidents from lightning occur at uncertain intervals, and that they are scattered capriciously over the greater part of the surface of the earth. It is for this reason, essentially, that a Lightning-rod Committee needs to sit in permanence.

The Committee of the Meteorological Society, however, seems very soon to have lost sight of its own excellent design, and to have changed its plan into a mere Conference for the preparation of a report, which was drawn up under its auspices and printed and published in 1882, apparently by the Conference itself, and which assumes the form of a code of rules for the erection of lightning conductors, with numerous appendices referring to authorities which had been in some sense consulted. The report is published under the editorship of the Secretary, and simply as having been considered and adopted by the delegates of the Conference, who seem indeed to have concentrated their attention upon one subordinate object which had been proposed by the Meteorological Society, namely, 'the diffusion of exact information regarding the best 'form and arrangement of lightning conductors,' and to have

overlooked entirely the more important work of observation and record which had been contemplated by the Society in the first instance, and to which we have drawn attention.

The code of rules put forward by the Conference was obviously intended to possess the same kind of authority and position as the 'instructions' of the earlier French reports, and indeed its chief value seems to be the approval it accords to the practice of construction which had grown out of those instructions, and which is very generally in use at the present day. It virtually confirms most of the conclusions which had been arrived at by the French commissions.

The 'Rules' of the London Conference direct that the main stem of the conductor shall consist of a copper rod or tape, with an ascertained electrical conductivity amounting to ninety per cent. of that which pure copper would possess, and weighing six ounces per foot; or that it shall be an iron rod weighing two pounds and a quarter per foot; and that the earth connexion shall be made by a copper or iron plate presenting a superficial area of eighteen square feet, embedded in moist earth, and surrounded with coke. The terminal points are to be more prominent than those usually adopted in England, but they may be less so than the heavy *tiges* of thirty-three feet employed in France. The rod is not to be insulated from the building, but intimately connected with all large masses of metal used incidentally in the construction. All joints in its length are to be embedded in solder. Curves are not to be made too sharp, and ample provision is to be secured for free expansion and contraction by varying temperature. Water-mains and gas-mains are to be utilised as means of earth contact wherever practicable, and the conducting integrity of the rod is to be tested every year.

A careful perusal of the French instructions, or of Mr. Richard Anderson's very excellent manual upon lightning conductors, published in 1879, will show that this is substantially an authoritative acceptance of the measures already advised by the best authorities. It is, however, somewhat remarkable that in the report itself of the London Conference nothing whatever is said of the influence of length in reducing the efficacy of a conductor. This is the more strange, because, in speaking of the care required for the formation of joints in the 'final decision of the Conference on controverted points,' the report categorically remarks that bad joints have the same effect as '*lengthening a conductor*,' and a reference is incidentally made to one instance, in which a bad joint was found to have had the same effect on a discharge of electricity that

the lengthening of a conductor to 1,900 miles would have had. This nevertheless was a point that was perfectly understood by the French investigators, and it is obviously one in which the London code is behind its predecessors. In the first French instructions, issued in 1823, there is a paragraph which says:—

‘Among the conducting bodies there are none, however, which do not oppose *some* resistance to the passage of the electric force; this resistance to the passage, *being repeated in every portion of the conductor, increases with its length*, and may exceed that which would be offered by a worse, but shorter, conductor. Conductors of small diameter also conduct worse than those of larger diameter.’

It follows, as a matter of absolute certainty from this increase of resistance with augmented length, that a conductor which was of ample dimensions for the protection of a building eighty feet high would not be of the same efficacy for a building 400 feet high. It is for this reason that M. Melsens employed eight main conductors for the Hôtel de Ville at Brussels, and it is for this reason that eight half-inch copper ropes have been carried down from the lantern and cupola in St. Paul's. To use eight main conductors of a given size is obviously, in an electrical sense, the same thing as to use one conductor only of eight times the size.* The practice of the French engineers has hitherto been to double the sectional capacity of the rod for each additional eighty feet of the length that is to be protected by its instrumentality. This practice is a sound one, and certainly should be observed.

There is one other particular in reference to the Conference report to which it seems desirable to draw attention on account of the erroneous doctrine to which it may possibly give a sanction. Amongst the appendices which have been added to the report there is a table, obviously prepared at the cost of some labour, which professes to give the sizes of lightning conductors recommended by various authorities. In order to facilitate the comparison of the several sizes, all have been reduced to what has been termed the equivalent dimensions of copper. But the oversight has been made, in preparing this table, of treating all cases of galvanised iron as if the zinc in the combination had no other function than the protection of the iron from rust. In reality, however, a

* The solid copper tape which is chiefly used by Mr. Anderson is, to meet the circumstance here alluded to, manufactured of four different sizes, the smallest being $\frac{5}{8}$ inch wide and $\frac{1}{16}$ inch thick, and the largest $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch wide and $\frac{1}{8}$ inch thick.

galvanised iron rod conducts as a combination of iron and zinc, in which the zinc possesses a much higher conducting power than the iron. Zinc surpasses iron in this particular at least three times. All the statements of conductivity that have been drawn from galvanised iron conductors have hence been given much too low. The influence of a too powerful electrical discharge upon a conductor of galvanised iron is, in the first instance, to strip off its coating of zinc by melting this more readily fusible metal. But until this is done the zinc assists very materially in the transmission of the discharge. Practically it is known that galvanised iron ropes effectually transmit discharges which could not be safely carried by ungalvanised ropes of the same diameter. The table is on this account worthless for the purpose for which it was avowedly prepared. It attributes to several of the authorities which are named views on the matter of the size of lightning conductors which they would certainly not endorse. For instance, Mr. Preece, the eminent electrician, is represented as holding that a copper wire with a sectional area of only the one-hundredth part of a square inch is 'sufficient to serve as a lightning-rod for any house.' The authority upon which this startling statement is made is a passage in the 'Journal of the Society of Telegraph Engineers,' in which Mr. Preece says that he thinks 'galvanised iron wire one-quarter of an inch in diameter is sufficient for the protection of any house.' It needs no very large amount of acquaintance with electrical matters to enable the reader to understand that Mr. Preece would not himself have expressed the same confidence in a small copper bell-wire such as is given as the equivalent in the table of the report. Taken in connexion with the omission of all reference to the increased resistance in long conductors, it might be inferred from this estimate that Mr. Preece would hold a small copper bell-wire, carried from the golden cross of St. Paul's to the ground, to be a sufficient protection for the great metropolitan cathedral.

In his 'Notes et Commentaires sur la question des Paratonnerres,' printed in 1882, Professor Melsens complains that no notice of his system of numerous conductors of weak or small section has been taken in the code of laws of the Lightning-rod Conference of London, even as a possible alternative of construction, a silence which he interprets as equivalent to a formal condemnation. His own words are:—

'Quoi qu'il en soit, j'ai cru que le silence que la Conférence garde dans son code de loi sur l'application possible de mon système, équivalait à une condamnation; j'aurais été heureux de voir la Conférence

se prononcer, nettement, sans réticence aucune, soit *pour*, soit *contre* l'ensemble du système, ou son adoption concurremment avec les paratonnerres qu'elle ordonne ou qu'elle préconise; les savants éminents, qui en font partie, n'auraient pas manqué, dans ce cas, de discuter les points essentiels, au grand profit de l'élucidation de la question scientifique et pratique, surtout dans les points sujets encore à discussion, et dans lesquels on rencontre des opinions très opposées. On comprend que je dois regretter profondément, eu égard, surtout, aux savants éminents qui sont membres de la Commission anglaise, le silence qu'elle a cru devoir garder sur mon nouveau système de paratonnerres, en donnant les règles et les lois qui, d'après elle, constituent la protection la plus efficace, abstraction faite de toute considération sur les constructeurs qui usent si largement de la réclame, ou qui sont protégés par de soi-disant brevets d'invention.'

The distinguished electrician of Brussels is not without good ground for this complaint, but he may console himself for his disappointment in the approval of his system that has been accorded by other highly competent authorities. In his 'Report on Static Electricity and Paratonnerres' at the International Exhibition of Electricity at Paris in 1881, Professor M. E. Rousseau says:—

'From the comparative examination that I have made, I am convinced that in each of the three constituent parts of which the lightning conductor is composed, namely, the point, the rod, and the root or earth contact, the system of M. Melsens has a marked superiority over the old system; and, as MM. Angot and Nardi have remarked, must be regarded as efficacious as the old system, if not more so, besides being at the same time less costly.'*

M. Angot, the author of an able treatise on Elementary Physics, printed in Paris in 1881, speaks of Professor Melsens' system of lightning protection as being 'more efficacious, as well as less costly, than the older plan, and sure to 'come soon into general use.' M. Nardi in a memoir on 'The Parafulmine of Melsens,' printed at Vicenza in 1881, describes the multiple system of points and rods and the large earth contacts adopted by Professor Melsens as being 'the 'most rational, the most efficacious, the most easy to construct and fix, and the least costly of all the alternative 'systems of construction.' M. Mascart, Professor of Physics in the College of France, in his excellent treatise on Static Electricity, describes the entire system devised by Professor Melsens as 'forming, without any doubt, the most beautiful

* Professor Melsens estimates that the cost of effective protection by the old system amounts to very nearly $4\frac{1}{2}$ francs the square mètre, but by his system to only 0.66 of a franc the square mètre.

‘model of the paratonnerre that has been realised.’ The frank and outspoken acceptance and praise of France, Italy, and Belgium may therefore fairly be placed as a set-off against what Professor Melsens feels to be the discourteous, if not condemnatory, silence of London.

Since the appearance of the Report of the Lightning-rod Conference a small volume has been published by ‘Major ‘Arthur Parnell, of the Royal Engineers,’* entitled ‘The ‘Action of Lightning, and the Means of defending Life and ‘Property from its Effects.’ In this little book the author has been at the pains to compile a reference to a very large number of accidents that have been occasioned by lightning. This, however, has been done for an ulterior and somewhat insidious purpose. He has a new theory of his own to propound, and a revolution in the practice of lightning-rod engineering to propose. He wishes to do away altogether with the lightning-rod as a dangerous and superfluous expedient, and to establish in its place a system of earth-buried plates and short earth points surrounding the building. Space does not here permit an allusion to the various fallacies which are involved in this heretical scheme. It will be enough for all practical purposes to say that the proper answer to the dangerous heresy is an appeal to the argument of facts. There are innumerable instances on record in which lightning has been seen to strike lightning conductors with a luminous flash, and there are still more in which the extremity of the rod bears the traces of the passage through it of lightning; but in every case, if the rod has been of due size and properly constructed and fixed, the building associated with it has been entirely uninjured. The truth obviously is that the question of efficiency and safety entirely hangs upon the amplitude of the dimensions, the number and position of the points, and the completeness of the earth contact, of conductors. In any case where these are insufficient the lightning-rod is a source of danger. In every case where they are ample, and where the system of their establishment is sound, the protection is complete. It will be time enough to enter upon a consideration of the merits of the retrograde course which is advocated in this ill-advised scheme when any single case of failure in a lightning conductor of satisfactory dimensions, and of tested perfection of construction, has been established before a competent jury on incontrovertible grounds. The failures incident upon defective work—as all unbiassed and

* Now Colonel Parnell.

properly trained thinkers are aware—are amongst the weightiest of the arguments that tell in favour of the employment of conductors.

In a very large majority of the cases in which accidents have occurred to buildings which have been furnished with lightning conductors, the mischief has been actually traced by competent enquiry to some easily recognised fault or deficiency of construction. A very instructive illustration of the accuracy of this remark has quite recently presented itself in a form which is worthy of notice. Shortly after midnight, on the 26th November, during a thunderstorm of some severity, a flash of lightning struck the lightning conductor attached to the spire of Chichester Cathedral, and scattered a considerable portion of it into fragments. A letter from 'A Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society' forthwith appeared in the 'English Mechanic and World of Science,' drawing attention to the accident, and commenting upon it in the following words:— 'This seems to open a very serious question indeed, because if so elaborate an affair as the Chichester conductor proved so much worse than useless when a thunderstorm came, what security have we that a similar disaster may not befall at, say, the Government magazines at Purfleet or elsewhere?' In reference to the accident which called forth this note of alarm, it may be at once, however, said that it belonged essentially to the class of occurrences which have been pointed at in the beginning of this paragraph. The conductor which was attached to the spire was not adequate and competent for the protective work which it was intended to perform. It had been put up sixteen years ago, when a new spire was erected in the place of the old one, which fell in consequence of having been added as an after-thought to a tower that had not been prepared to bear its weight, and was of a form which is, happily, now obsolete. It originally consisted of twelve No. 15 gauge* copper wires arranged in a double series, side by side, and held together by a double strand of zinc and copper wire crossing them transversely, and acting as a kind of weft to the longitudinal copper warp. The conductor was thus a sort of ribbon of copper wire, with transverse binding-threads of zinc. The weight of the metal in this compound conductor was $10\frac{1}{4}$ oz. per yard, instead of being 36 oz. per yard, as it ought to have been at the very least if it had fulfilled the conditions that are now required for such a task as it had been required to perform. But besides this, in consequence of

That is of $\frac{1}{16}$ th of an inch in diameter.

having been exposed for sixteen years in its sub-littoral situation to the blasts of the moist sea wind, the copper wires were in many places eaten into by corrosive action where the zinc wire of the woof crossed them, so as to reduce to some considerable extent their original conducting capacity. The conductor was so fixed that it descended from the summit of the spire along the slope, and along the face of the tower, then crossed the lead flashing of the roof, passed down the main wall of the building near the intersection of one of the transepts with the nave, and was finally plunged into a well dug into the graveyard about twenty feet from the place where it reached the ground. At the time of the storm a flash of light was seen to pass along the upper part of the track of the conductor, and this flash was accompanied by an instantaneous crash of thunder, that awoke most of the slumbering inhabitants of the close. The destruction of the conductor, however, was not discovered until the second morning after the storm, when some shattered fragment was observed projecting from the tower. It was then found that about forty feet of the conductor at the top of the spire still remained uninjured in its place, but that for the next one hundred feet below this the woven metallic band had been scattered into a shower of short fragments of copper wire, which were strewn thickly upon the roof of the tower, and of the lower building. These fragments were three-quarters of an inch long, corresponded in length with the materials of the transverse crossings of the zinc wire, and bore unmistakeable indications of galvanic corrosion upon their ends. The lower portion of the conductor was uninjured, but one of the iron rain-pipes, which descended from the roof of the transept a few feet away, had been shattered by the discharge. It was therefore manifest that from the leaden covering of the roof downwards the incompetent conductor had been assisted in its work by the roof and its numerous iron rain-pipes, and this intelligibly accounted for its own preservation through that portion of its course; and it was also clear that the earth communication of the conductor was not ample enough for the transmission of the entire discharge, as if it had been the lower part of the conductor would have been shattered like the upper part, and the rain-pipe would have remained uninjured. The resistance of the earth-communication of the conductor, measured through the uninjured fragment, was 65 ohms, that is some twelve or sixteen times greater than under any circumstances it ought to have been. So far, therefore, from this maligned conductor being open to reproach, it had done exactly what it was

scientifically bound to do, and what any expert could have foretold that it would do, under the circumstances which have been described.

But the critic who sounded the note of alarm in 'The English Mechanic' was also egregiously wrong in another by no means unimportant particular. The unfairly maligned conductor had not 'proved worse than useless when a thunderstorm came.' As some more appreciative commentator figuratively, but not inaptly, remarked at the time, it had 'gallantly died at its post in the efficient performance of its duty.' Although the lightning conductor was destroyed, the exceedingly beautiful stone spire remained absolutely uninjured. It had not even a scar upon its face. This circumstance of the destruction of a lightning-rod of too narrow capacity without injury to the building to which it is attached, is by no means of infrequent occurrence. About five inches of the top of the second conductor which Franklin himself erected in Philadelphia were destroyed by a discharge, which was seen to strike the rod, and which also made itself visible in a luminous blaze in the dry earth around its base; and Franklin adroitly claimed the incident as a proof that nature itself had borne testimony in favour of his invention. The brass wire conductor of the war ship 'Jupiter' was struck at sea on June 13, 1854, and the sixty brass wires of which it was composed were shattered into fragments the size of a pin. But no injury was done to the vessel. A large number of instances of a kind very similar to this well-known and altogether typical case might be adduced did space permit. But it must not therefore be inferred that so desirable a result is in the proper order of events. When a lightning-rod 'dies at its post' in a successful defence, as in the memorable Chichester case, the auspicious issue is due to the accidental circumstance that no better extraneous earth contact is within the striking reach of the discharge. If this were the case, the lightning would certainly be diverted from the course of the conductor into the more facile way, and, in making its devious leap into the more available path, would be quite sure to leave the marks of its divergent passage in some undesirable form. It is on this account, as well as because of the wasteful outlay which is required to supply a new rod when an old one has been destroyed, that lightning conductors of insufficient dimensions, and of bad principles of construction, are by no means to be looked upon with tolerance, to say nothing of favour, notwithstanding the occasional good service that may be entered to their account.

Irrespective of all theoretical considerations, and upon purely experimental and demonstrative grounds, it is possible in the present state of electrical science to definitely state what it is that an electrical engineer has to do when he undertakes to protect buildings against the destructive force of lightning. He has, in the first place, to make sure that wherever the lightning can fall it shall find an open and practically unobstructed path to traverse in its passage to the ground. He is quite sure that the electric discharge will confine itself to the track of a conductor, and will pass quietly and harmlessly along it, provided its dimensions are adequate to the task of transmission, and provided the inlets and outlets are sufficiently capacious for its unimpeded reception and escape. It is a thoroughly established and altogether indisputable canon of electrical science that when a discharge has to pass through a conductor of too narrow size, and with obstructed inlets and outlets, it, of necessity, accomplishes its passage as a turbulent and ill-regulated force all the way, with a tendency at every step to make a devious outburst or overflow; and that when it passes through a conductor of ample dimensions, and with unimpeded ingress and egress, it is devoid of all erratic impulse, and traverses the appointed channel as an obedient and well-trained power. The task of the engineer, therefore, resolves itself primarily into so arranging his apparatus as to keep the lightning in its well-ordered and harmless state so long as it is in the close neighbourhood of buildings that might be injured by any uncontrolled outburst through a devious path. There are three ways in which he can seek to accomplish this purpose. He can multiply and, as it were, enlarge the gates of ingress by increasing the number of his air-terminals and earth contacts through which the discharge may have to be gathered into the conductor. He can augment the dimensions and the carrying capacity of the conductor, and he can amplify the outlets of escape, whether in the direction of the cloud or earth. Where these conditions have been properly secured, there is not the most remote probability that the conductor will fail in its appointed task. This is not a question that is now open to doubt. It is as certain that the lightning will traverse a well-arranged and competent conductor, rather than the building to which this is attached, as it is that the electric spark from the charged conductor of an electrical machine will strike a brass ball and rod, and will not strike a stick of sealing-wax or of dry wood, when these are presented side by side. As a matter of fact it is sometimes imperfectly insulated tracts of the surface of the earth that are inductively

charged by the propinquity of an overhanging storm-cloud, and sometimes the overhanging cloud that is inductively charged by disturbances originating in the ground. But the conductor provided by the electrical engineer acts in precisely the same way, and with equal efficiency, in either case. It provides the means by which the electrical disturbance may set itself at rest in a quiet and unexplosive way. The chief danger that has to be feared is the purely economical one that there is always a tendency on the part of the imperfectly informed public to limit too narrowly the cost, and in that way to impair the efficacy, of the engineer's work. The duty of the engineer is, summarily, to see that his building is adequately covered above by the lines of the conducting network, that the main channel of his conductor is ample for any storm overflow that it can, by any possibility, be called upon to accommodate, and that the outlet to the earth is capacious and free. Even in the present state of electrical science it can, with the utmost confidence, be affirmed, not only that wherever destructive accidents have occurred in association with lightning conductors, such accidents have, in every case, been due to the circumstance that the conductors have been of faulty construction, but also that in by far the greater number of instances the fault has been in the least conspicuous and least obvious part of the apparatus, where the earth contact has to be established. In his report on the lightning conductors of the Paris International Exhibition, Professor Rousseau states that it is in this particular that lightning-rods most generally and most flagrantly fail. In one passage of the report he says:—

‘I do not know whether I have defined with sufficient precision what is implied in a good communication with the earth, but I think the principle, at any rate, may be laid down that the communication of a lightning conductor with the earth cannot be considered good if it is inferior to that of any masses of metal that lie in its close neighbourhood. If this is the case, it may be anticipated, as has so frequently been found, that the lightning will quit the paratonnerre to pass to the object which is in better communication with the earth. It is thus that buildings have been frequently set fire to by lightning which has leaped from paratonnerres to gas-pipes. In one notable case, after striking the conductor of a church in New Haven, United States, the lightning left the conductor to pierce a brick wall fifty centimètres (nearly twenty inches) thick, to get at a gas-pipe which rose twenty feet out of the ground a little distance off.’

We ourselves some little time ago investigated the nature of an accident occasioned by lightning, which so strikingly

confirms the views expressed by Professor Rousseau, that it is worthy of being specifically brought under notice here. In the year 1865 the tower of the church of All Saints, in Nottingham, was struck by lightning during a severe thunder-storm. The tower was one hundred and fifty feet high, and had a small rope of copper wire, intended to serve as a lightning conductor, descending along its west face from one of its corner pinnacles to the ground, where the rope terminated by being coiled round a stone buried a few inches in the dry soil. On the inner face of the same wall of the tower, near its base, and only separated from the conductor by a solid stone wall four feet six inches thick, there was fixed a gas-standard of iron, which was used in lighting the church. The lightning in its descent left the conductor at this point, and passed through the solid mass of masonry, to reach the standard, knocking out a large circular breach in the stonework by the way. It preferred to take this devious path, and to avail itself of the facilities which the capacious gas-main connexions of the town afforded it for the accomplishment of its escape into the earth, rather than to embarrass itself with the still more onerous task of forcing its way into the dry soil at the bottom of the tower, through the too briefly terminated coil of the rope. The floor and pews of the church were found to be on fire the day after the storm, and some considerable mischief was done before the conflagration could be stopped. This fire was almost certainly due to the circumstance that the gas-pipe from the standard was connected with the meter and the mains by means of a short length of soft fusible gas-pipe in a small basement room under the floor of the church. But when an investigation into the cause of the fire was subsequently instituted, no one seemed to be able to say whether an escape of gas from the injured pipe had been lit up at the time of the lightning discharge, or whether the actual lighting of the gas was due to some subsequent introduction of a burning flame into the neighbourhood of the gas-meter.

The obvious method of guarding against accidents of this class is the simple expedient, wherever gas-pipes are concerned, of connecting the termination of the conductor directly, by means of a sufficiently ample metallic band, with one of the large iron pipes of the general system of the mains. If this had been done with the lower extremity of the rope, in the case of the tower of All Saints Church, instead of merely twisting it round a stone in the dry surface soil, the injury to the wall at the bottom of the tower, and the consequent train of accidents which culminated in the burning of the floor of

the church, would have been physically impossible. The lightning would then have gone through the large, open, and direct route to the mains, instead of piercing a stone wall four feet six inches thick, and leaping across a small fusible gas-pipe to get there.

The case is precisely of the same nature as the accidents alluded to by Professor Rousseau. The earth communication of the copper rope being inferior to that of the neighbouring gas-pipe, the lightning quitted the rope to get at the ground through the pipe. No more striking and instructive illustration of the danger of insufficient earth contacts could possibly be furnished.

A still more curious illustration of a somewhat similar kind occurred at Chichester, simultaneously with the destruction of the lightning-rod which has been already alluded to. The boundary of the cathedral close in one direction is marked by a tall and stout iron rail, which divides its precincts from the main street of the town. On the side of this street which is opposite to the cathedral stands the Dolphin, the principal hotel of the city. About an hour after the accident, and whilst the inmates of the hotel who had been startled by the lightning and thunder were still awake, and in some alarm, a smell of fire was perceived to be pervading the house. The landlord at once rose, and proceeded to investigate the cause, and was led by the odour of burning wood to one of the cellars in the basement, where he found the small gas-pipe fixed to furnish it with light melted for several inches, a large flame issuing from the improvised gap, and a beam of wood a little above the blaze already on fire. A thorough and exhaustive examination of the place at the time, and afterwards, revealed no trace anywhere else of the passage of the lightning. A water-pipe running in from the outside main, however, transversely crossed, and almost touched, the gas-pipe as this descended from the ceiling to the bracket, and just where the gap had been made. The popular notion amongst the servants of the hotel was that the lightning had come in through some open cracks in the cellar-door from the pavement of the street, that it had run along the water-pipe, and that it had cut through the gas-pipe as it passed across. The more scientific explanation of the insidious invasion by fire, in the dead of the night, no doubt is that, when the discharge of lightning issued from the cloud to the earth, it had scattered itself in various directions, using such stepping-stones by the way as offered in its path. One part of the discharge, then, first seizing upon the gas-pipes connected with the street lamps, took a course through them

to reach the earth, but, coming opportunely by the way across the water-pipe in the cellar of the hotel, transferred itself to that pipe on account of the greater facilities that were offered by it for making an easy and good earth through the largely expanded subterranean mains, but 'sparked' as it passed from pipe to pipe, and in doing so opened a breach in the small fusible metal wire, and lit the gas as it began to escape. The flame then enlarged the breach by melting a considerable portion of the pipe, and was making good progress towards burning down the house, when its mischievous proceedings were happily discovered, and arrested in the manner which has been described.

The telegraph wire which, according to the opinion of Mr. Preece, may be sufficient for the protection of any house, is also, it must be remembered, capable of acting as a source of very considerable danger in circumstances that are by no means unfrequently encountered in the arrangements of everyday life. At the time of thunderstorms, portions of the electrical discharge are apt to be conveyed into the interior of buildings by telegraph and telephone wires that are distributed to them for the service of signalling instruments, and may possibly set fire to badly conducting and inflammable substances that chance to be in connexion with them. Instances of this form of accident are now often met with, especially in situations where telegraph wires are carried to outlying post-offices over high and exposed tracts of land. In such cases it is, most generally, not the full force of the lightning discharge which effects the mischief, but the partial and secondary discharges which take place in consequence of the influence of induction. The long stretch of insulated wire, having been inductively charged by the near approach of some storm-cloud, sympathetically discharges itself of its accumulated force when the tension of the cloud is relieved by an outburst of lightning in some other direction. The shocks occasionally experienced by telegraph clerks when handling their instruments during the prevalence of thunderstorms in the neighbourhood are due to this cause. It sometimes happens, however, that an actual discharge of lightning does involve a telegraph wire, and such discharge is then usually distributed so that it passes to the earth in small broken outbursts wherever it can find an outlet. In such instances enough of the fragmentary discharge may fall to the share of some signalling office to produce very grave mischief. Telegraph wires should, on this account, never be carried into the interior of dwelling-houses, or of inhabited places, without appropriate arrangements having

been made to neutralise the risk. The plan which is most usually adopted for the protection of instruments and operators in such circumstances consists in the ingenious expedient of arranging two broad metal plates so that their contiguous surfaces be face to face a very small distance apart, one of the plates being in immediate connexion with the telegraph wire, whilst the other is in communication with the ground. The narrow interval between the two plates is then sufficient to prevent any escape of the ordinary electrical current of low intensity which is employed in telegraph work, but upon the occasion of the wire becoming accidentally charged with an electrical force of high intensity, such as is produced by the agency of the thunder-cloud, this leaps through the narrow space by virtue of its superior explosive power, and so escapes harmlessly to the earth, instead of making its way through some more devious and dangerous route. The plates are, of course, designedly fixed where they serve to intercept the discharge by the temptation of the more open and free passage to the earth, and in that way divert it from the dangerous course which it would otherwise pursue.

The best course for the electrical engineer, who is planning the protection of any building against lightning, is therefore, on account of the various considerations which have been urged, to begin with the arrangement of that which is the primary essential, the earth contact. In towns where there is a large system of water supply and gas distribution at hand, this is generally an easy task. But it by no means follows that, where the main pipes of water and gas supplies are not available, a square yard of sheet copper or iron, buried in the ground, can in all cases be accepted as a satisfactory earth connexion. It certainly would not have been so in the instance of All Saints Church. In the circumstances which have been described in speaking of the accident there, a yard-square earth plate could not have been depended upon to prevent the mischief. The lightning would still have preferred the largely developed root of the gas-mains to any such puny substitute, although such an earth plate, well bedded in moist ground, might have served all purposes in the absence of so formidable a competitor. The condition of safety is that which has been so well stated by Professor Rousseau. The communication of the conductor with the earth must not be inferior to that of any neighbouring mass of metal. When the arrangement for the earth connexion has been efficiently settled, the conductor may be carried up from it, and this may with equal assurance be done either upon the single rod system of

Gay-Lussac or upon the multiple rod principle of Professor Melsens, so long as the building is of moderate size and of a compact form. But if the building is of large dimensions and of irregular form, the single conductor will of necessity have to assume an approximation to the multiple type as the main stem is branched out above to bring every gable and turret and pinnacle of the structure under its protection. It is only when it has been completed by a broadly cast net of metallic meshes and lines, that the old early dogma of the protected area can be now allowed to survive even in the mind of the engineer. When the work of construction has been so far carried out, it is still, however, not to be looked upon as complete until the stamp of efficiency has been placed upon it by the application of the final test, which the advance of electrical science has now placed in the hands of the constructor. It is the crowning distinction of this system of defence, that by a very easy process it can be at once ascertained whether all the arrangements of the engineer have been properly carried out. By the employment of the ingenious piece of apparatus which is known as the 'Differential Galvanometer,' the electrician can in a few minutes ascertain what the resistance is that would be offered between the air-terminal and the earth communication of a conductor, if a discharge of lightning fell upon the rod. That resistance must never be left unheeded if it amounts to anything in excess of the quantity which is technically known as two ohms. It is quite possible indeed, by the exercise of judgement and skill, to reduce the resistance in every case somewhat below that. With a conductor which has recently been erected upon the Hall of General Assembly in Edinburgh, it was found at the final test that the earth resistance was only the 0.7th of an ohm. But the galvanometer test must not only be applied as the last step of the construction; it must also be drawn upon from time to time, and at not too distant intervals, to ascertain how far the originally well-conceived and well-executed work is, or is not, in process of being injuriously affected by the physical agencies that are at all times in antagonistic operation to the constructive efforts of man. The free and frequent use of the testing galvanometer is, indeed, the natural consummation of the beneficent work which was initiated by Franklin one hundred and thirty years ago. Without this instrument the lightning conductor is a hopeful, and very generally helpful expedient. But with the galvanometer, it is now assuredly competent to take rank as a never-failing protection.

ART. III.—*The Chiefs of Grant.* By WILLIAM FRASER, LL.D.
3 vols. quarto. Edinburgh [Privately printed]: 1883.

‘THE Chiefs of Grant’ adds another to the long list of remarkable achievements in Scottish family history associated with the name of that accomplished genealogist and antiquarian whom the late Sir William Stirling Maxwell was wont to call ‘the luminous and voluminous Fraser.’ These histories are not all of equal value, and the one now under review is among the least important of the whole in a purely historical sense; yet it must be said for Mr. Fraser’s qualities as an editor, that in all that series, now extending to sixteen or eighteen volumes, there is not one less notable than another for the fidelity with which its contents have been compiled, for the accuracy with which documents are reproduced, and for the unflinching skill and industry which he has brought to his task. Being private collections, these works of Mr. Fraser are not accessible to the general public; it is important, therefore, that those interested in historical research should have some indication given them of the field covered by these volumes, and of the nature and extent of the materials embraced within them. For this reason we have on several former occasions reviewed in this Journal the kindred works in which Mr. Fraser has recorded the historical and domestic annals of the great houses of Carluheroch, of Lennox, of Buccleuch, and of Cromarty. They are, in fact, known to the public through no other channel, as none of these works have been published for sale. We therefore gladly resume so congenial a task. That which immediately concerns us at present is the magnificent monograph now before us, in which is recorded with patient labour all that is worth knowing of the great Highland house of Grant of Grant.

The chief ambition of a Scottish family is to be accounted old. Riches and greatness are very well and very desirable in themselves; but the crown of honour is family antiquity. Quaint old Sir Thomas Urquhart of Cromarty was less pleased to be the first translator of Rabelais into English than to be able to tell that he was the hundred and forty-third in direct descent from Adam, and the hundred and thirty-fourth in line from Noah. This honourable ambition is by no means dead even yet. It is only a few years ago that a Highland family published a pedigree in solemn quarto, in which the family name was traced by immaculate descent from a

Scottish king who lived some three centuries before Christ; and the editor placed his book before the public without a smile on his face. The Grants, like all old families worth the name, have been honoured with a like remote and fabulous origin: in their case the pedigree starts with no less a personage than Wodin or Odin, the Jupiter of Northern mythology—himself, however, under the iconoclastic hands of the editors of the '*Corpus Poeticum Boreale*,' now somewhat shorn of his long antiquity. But Mr. Fraser is not fond of fables, and hence, in the spirit of enlightened modern research, he has wisely discarded all such mythical origins for the families whose fortunes he has undertaken to trace. He is content to follow them, for the main part, through the briefer but more intelligible period of existence indicated by the stream of authentic historical documents. Shutting his ears at once to the uncertain sound of Scandinavian myths, and the equally uncertain voices of those shameless prevaricators the Celtic senachies or bards, he listens only to the testimony of such indubitable records as have escaped the effacing finger of time and the still more destructive brand of war. In this respect he sets a wholesome example to the compilers of Northern genealogies, whose efforts of imagination, woven into the zigzag fabric of pedigrees, have not, of late years, been quite creditable to the accuracy and the intelligence of our Highland press.

Following rational guidance, therefore, Mr. Fraser finds that the first persons of the name of Grant, who appear in any way as connected with the north of Scotland are Sir Laurence and Sir Robert le Grant, whose names occur among the witnesses to an authentic document of the year 1258. From the manner in which these names are written, he fairly enough infers that the name of Grant is of Anglo-Norman extraction. This inference is further supported by the fact that in a roll of the companions of William, Duke of Normandy, in 1066, cited by De Magny, there appears, along with Melville, Hay, and other well-known Scottish patronymics, the name of 'Robert Grante.' Again, in 1270, Henry III. gives permission to a number of Anglo-Norman knights to proceed to the Holy Land, and among these is one called William le Grant. He further adduces reasonable proof that the Grants of England, as had before been suggested by the historian of Beaulieu Priory, first found their way north into the Highlands of Scotland in the train of the powerful family of the Bissets, who were then extensive landowners both in England and Scotland, and with whom he

discovers the Grants were, in the first half of the thirteenth century, closely allied by marriage. The Bissets, or Bysets, are chiefly remembered for their alleged connexion with the mysterious death of the Earl of Athole at Haddington in 1242, and the older Scottish historians and genealogists generally represent them as having been almost extirpated, certainly expatriated, in consequence of that event. There is no reason to doubt that they fell under suspicion in connexion with Athole's death, and that their chiefs did leave Scotland for a time; but that exile must have been of short duration, as Mr. Fraser cites Walter Byset among the witnesses to a charter of Alexander III. to the monks of Dunfermline, dated at Stirling in the beginning of 1249.

Whether the above Laurence and Robert le Grant were brothers, or otherwise related to each other, has not been determined. Robert was the first to acquire territory in Moray. About 1258 he obtained from John Prat, *miles* or knight, a grant of the land of Clonmanache, now Coulmony, on the river Findhorn. Laurence was the more distinguished of the two, and became, some time before 1263, the king's sheriff of Inverness, which sheriffdom, at that time, comprehended the present counties of Ross, Sutherland, and Caithness. He was also bailie of Inverquoch. But while these two Grants are thus named together as contemporary proprietors or residents in Morayshire in the thirteenth century, it has been impossible to find any link connecting either of them genealogically with the alleged head of the Grants of Grant, namely, John le Grant, who, in 1316, received a grant of the lands of Inverallan in Strathspey. From this John, called First of Inverallan, Mr. Fraser endeavours to trace the descent of the family of Grant of Grant. In doing so, he exhibits a wealth of genealogical erudition, a breadth and minuteness of research, and an amount of painstaking labour which are little short of marvellous, and which cannot fail to excite the admiration of those who have any idea of the immense toil which such investigations involve. We wish we could add that in this case the result is worth the labour. It is impossible to look at the opening page of the genealogical table appended to the first volume without seeing that it is full of the most disappointing breaks, which not all the learned ingenuity of the author has been able to bridge over. We have carefully striven to follow his reasoning through the first five chapters of his history, but are unable, when done, to come to any decision as to the order

of succession in the family pedigree which he has evidently set himself to determine. His case is not stated with the clearness which his industry merits, and which the subject demands; and he has, unfortunately, raised so many side issues, and has introduced so many extraneous genealogical details, that we have not found it possible to formulate the terms of his arguments into anything which may stand as a consecutive piece of reasoning. We are not going to dispute the accuracy of his conclusions, for we are not quite clear that we have been able to discover what they are; we have certainly failed in apprehending his premisses. It seems to us that it would have been a decided gain, both to the author and the reader, if great part of these minute investigations had been relegated to an appendix, and a single chapter, in place of five, been devoted to a clear, succinct, and, if possible, simple statement of the conclusions at which the author had arrived, with a general indication of the grounds upon which these conclusions had been reached. As they stand, the chapters are a kind of genealogical puzzle, the answer to which, to judge by the breaks in the page of the genealogical table already referred to, the author himself has been, after all, baffled to discover.

In giving up the first five chapters we must also give up the first five lairds of Grant. In doing so, nothing is lost in an historical sense, as the shadowy details told of the respective chiefs are not likely to interest many beyond the mechanical makers and recorders of pedigrees, which class may, however, find here much fine disputations feeding. But when we pass on to the sixth chief on the record, we get rid of the 'waste threads and thrums' of pedigree-mongering, and feel ourselves dealing with appreciable historical fact. As the author remarks, 'from this point of the pedigree down to the present day, all is clear, each link in the long chain of ancestors being attested by authentic evidence.' The chief referred to, who ought really to be regarded as the ascertained head of the house—though such recognition of his claims would grievously curtail the antiquity of the family—was Sir Duncan Grant, first laird of Freuchie, who belonged to the period 1434–1485. But neither Sir Duncan nor his immediate successors make any prominent figure in the history of their respective periods. They married and gave in marriage; they bought lands from one neighbour and disputed about lands with another; suffered molestation at times from the hordes of native banditti, and occasionally, no doubt—though Mr. Fraser is

very tender with the reputation of the Grants—took their part in the congenial work of molesting others. The tenor of the family career is, at this time, very commonplace, and they do not seem to have risen above the level of secondary Highland lairds. Even in the greater risings in the North against the monarch and the constituted government—such as happened more than once in the reigns of Mary and her son James—the Grants occupy a subordinate position, only appearing among the supporters, or, as it might happen, the opponents, of one or other of the greater barons—Huntly, or Athole, or Argyll—who kept the Highlands almost perpetually in a state of civil war. To the honour of these Grants, however, it must be placed on record that they were almost always found on the side of public order and of loyalty to the Crown. Mr. Fraser only briefly, and in general but incidentally, alludes to these insurrections, his purpose having apparently been not so much to connect the family with the main stream of national history, as to give, in minute and consecutive detail, a record of their ‘conquests’ of land, their purchases, wadsets, apprisings, and infeftments, with careful descriptions of the boundaries of each newly-acquired holding, as described in the notarial instruments preserved in the family charter-chest, and printed in full in the third volume. This will form agreeable reading to the lairds who now hold the lands so described, and to attorneys’ clerks on the look-out for ‘styles;’ but for the general reader—well, a little conveyancing goes a long way.

Before passing on to the later generations of the family, it may be mentioned here that the principal lands held by the Grants were situated in Strathspey. Strathspey was indeed known as ‘the country of the Grants.’ The lands within that district were so exclusively occupied by the clan, that at one time no landowner held possessions there who did not bear the name of Grant. Yet it was not the original country of the Grants. ‘Their first known territorial designation,’ says Mr. Fraser, ‘was Lords of Stratherrick, from a district in the county of Inverness, now part of the Lovat estates. At an early period they acquired the lands of Inverallan in Strathspey, and about the middle and end of the fifteenth century added to their possessions Freuchie (frequently designated Ballachastell, and now Castle Grant) and Glencairn. The title of Grants of Freuchie, with the occasional local designation of Lairds of Grant, continued in the family for ten generations, from

‘1450 to 1694, when Ludovick Grant, having obtained a Crown charter erecting his lands into the regality of Grant, dropped the territorial designation of Freuchie, and adopted that of Grant of Grant, by which his descendants continued to be known until they succeeded to the title and dignity of Earl of Seafield.’ It was the ambition of the above-named Ludovick to preserve all the lands lying between the two Craigellachies in the name of Grant. ‘These two rocky eminences are conspicuous objects in Strathspey. The upper or western Craigellachie forms the dividing boundary between Badenoch and Strathspey, and was the rendezvous for the Grant clan in time of war. The lower Craigellachie stands at the confluence of the Fiddich with the Spey. . . . The upper Craigellachie is generally supposed to have furnished the crest of the Grant family, which is a mountain in flames. When the chief wished the clan to assemble, fires were kindled on both Craigellachies; hence the name, *Rock of Alarm*. The war-cry of the clan was *Stan! fast, Craigellachie!* and their armorial motto is the same.’ The lands of Inverallan, the first acquired by the Grants in Strathspey, have ever since been inherited by them, with one interruption caused by the lands having been provided to co-heiresses. This led to a delightful case of litigation, which actually lasted throughout two whole centuries; but when we look at the names with which the law-papers bristle—the Gaichs and Glenbegs and Creggans, the Dreggies and Culcabocks and Knockintennails—it is impossible to grudge the lawyers their fees, for they must have been hardily earned.

The family record during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is far from inspiring, its chief feature being endless litigation and more or less of participation in miserable clan hostilities. The first point of illumination in this shifting cloudland of legal and tribal contention is not found until we come to the reign of James VI., when there suddenly rises above the horizon the ‘bright particular star’ of Lady Lilius Murray. She was the daughter of Sir John Murray of Tullibardine, and in 1591 married John Grant, fifth laird of Freuchie. This laird was one of the most spirited of his race, and did good service to the State by his activity in the repression of local banditti, as well as of the hordes of wandering gipsies who then infested the Highlands, and whom the Privy Council in their proclamations stigmatised as an ‘idill and wagabond peopill.’ The laird, regarding whose personal traits of character we have unfor-

fortunately little information, must have been a man of some individuality, with a becoming sense of his importance as the chief of his clan; for it is mentioned that when King James, in 1610, desired to raise him to the peerage, he declined the honour with the significant interrogatory, '*Wha'll be Laird o' Grant?*' It was this gallant laird who had for wife the Lady Liliass Murray. Lady Liliass was what few Highland dames of that period would possibly have cared to lay claim to being, a woman of fine literary tastes and intellectual endowments. She had, moreover, a library! From the list of her books still preserved in her own handwriting, we learn that they were twenty-eight in number—no mean collection in the Scottish Highlands of those days. The books are wholly of a religious and devotional character, and include '*St. Augustine*' and '*The Imitation of Christ*.' Among the others are (to follow her own phonetic orthography) '*Ane Buik to lerne to Leive and Dyc*,' '*The Handmed to Deevosioun*,' '*The Marrou of the Orrekallis of God*,' '*Of Prayer and Medetasioun, set furthe be Granadag fra Collen*,' '*The Prakteis of Peyattiey*,' and the like. The only contemporary notice we have of this remarkable lady is from Taylor the Water Poet. In the character of the '*penniless pilgrim*,' Taylor undertook a journey from London to Scotland without any money, evangelically trusting to the reputation of the Scots for hospitality. He was not disappointed. In 1618 he got as far north as Ballachastell, the castle of the Grants, and was the guest of the family. He has left his testimony to the wealth and hospitality of the chief, and to the personal endowments of the lady. The passage is worth transcribing:—

'From thence [Braemar and Badenoch] we went to a place called Balloch Castle, a fair and stately house, a worthy gentleman being the owner of it, called the Laird of Grant; his wife being a gentlewoman honourably descended, being sister to the Right Honourable Earl of Athole, and to Sir Patrick Murray, Knight; she being, both inwardly and outwardly, plentifully adorned with the gifts of grace and nature, so that our cheer was more than sufficient, and yet much less than they could afford us. There stayed there four days four earls, one lord, divers knights and gentlemen, and their servants, footmen, and horses; in every meal four long tables furnished with all varieties, our first and second course being three score dishes at one board, and after that always a banquet; and there, if I had not forsworn wine till I came to Edinburgh, I think I had there drunk my last.'

The Water Poet is frank in his commendation of the Highland welcome he received; but we wish he had told us a

little more of Lady Liliass, and whether or not they had a 'swap o' rhyming ware' together; for Lady Liliass may be presumed to have been a poet. At all events, two poems have been found in her handwriting; and although Mr. Fraser has not been able to decide whether they are original or only copies, it may be inferred that he has not been able to find them in the works of any author extant. They are both of them written in the literary Scotch of the period; and, in the absence of other evidence, we may assume them to be the production of Lady Liliass. The two opening stanzas have merit enough to deserve quotation, with the spelling slightly modernised:—

'Down in yond bank where leaves grows rank
 And flowers do freshly spring,
 I heard ane may, both gallant and gay,
 Changing her note to sing:
 She sparit nocht to show her thoct,
 Wild wood and all could ring;
 I dare weill say, by my good fay,
 She was ane lover young.

'She sighed and said, My love is laid
 On one that has my heart,
 Whilk causes me so blythe to be,
 Into my heart inwart.
 God give that he were bound to me
 And never to depairt,
 That he and I might live and die
 In land or ony airt.'

. . .

The second poem appears to be the swain's reply, but is not equal in spirit and smoothness of versification to the first, which has the true ring of some of the best seventeenth-century lyrics.

If Lady Liliass was the poet who composed these lines, she had what not too many of the tuneful race can complain of, the misfortune of having lived too long. She was left a widow in 1622, and survived her husband till 1644, her later years being darkened by the calamities that overtook her house in the person of her only son John. He was twenty-nine years of age at the death of his father, and was naturally a man of a vigorous type of character. When but twenty-one years of age, he had received from King James the honour of knighthood, on the occasion of that monarch's visit to Scotland in 1617. He had been much associated with his father in transactions of a public nature, and must

at an early period of his life have shown exceptional talents for business. Towards the end of his father's life, indeed, he took upon himself the chief share in the management of the estates, even to the conducting of the lawsuits—a due number of which his father, as became a true Scotch laird, always had on his hands. In 1620 these lawsuits made it necessary that the young laird should make two visits to Edinburgh, and the record left of these journeys, thus summarised by Mr. Fraser, affords amusing grounds of contrast with the speed and convenience of modern travel:—

‘The young laird took journey south on Tuesday the 1st of February, the company consisting of six gentlemen on horseback, attended by nine “boys” or gillies, and one led horse. The route chosen was by Foyness, the residence of John Grant, younger of Ballindalloch, where they passed the first night; thence proceeding by Blackwater, Boat of Artlache, Kirk of Tullanessal, Boat of Don, Alford, Kincardine-on-Dee, Muireuilhous, Fettercairn, and Forfar, they arrived in Perth on the evening of the sixth day. The next day and evening were spent in Perth, and on the 8th February the journey was resumed by Bridge of Earn and Falkland to Burntisland. From this place six of the gillies were sent home with the horses, and the following day was occupied in crossing the Firth of Forth from Burntisland to Leith. Being belated, the laird put up for the night at Effie Wilson’s house, apparently an inn in the Canongate [outside the city walls], and only entered the city on the following day, the tenth after leaving Strathspey.’

One of the legal incidents of this visit affords a suggestive glimpse into the manner in which the judicial machinery of the Scottish Courts was occasionally tampered with in those days. The principal cause of the young laird’s journey at this time was a lawsuit between his father and George, Lord Gordon, eldest son of the Marquis of Huntley. Young Grant had secured, among other counsel, the services of Thomas Hope (afterwards the well-known Lord-Advocate of Charles I.), and Mr. Hope appears to have used his influence to get the trial of the cause put down for a particular day. When the case came to be heard, there seemed a probability that the hour when the Court rose for the day would be reached before the proceedings were completed, and this, for some technical or other reason, was not desirable. Accordingly, the device was resorted to of cheating the Court into a longer sitting, by bribing the bellman with the sum of twenty-four shillings (Scots, no doubt) to ‘hald bak the twelft hour till ‘the caus wer reasoned at lenthe.’ The stratagem was successful, and the young laird had the pleasure of obtaining the decision which he sought.

It may be noticed parenthetically that, while the laird and

his son Sir John were themselves exceedingly partial to a 'guid-gangin plea,' they did not relish the indulgence of the same luxury on the part of their kinsmen and retainers. On the occasion of the young laird's second visit to Edinburgh that same year, and on a similar errand to the first, he found that several of his people had come to town as witnesses in a petty plea between the lairds of Ballindalloch and Carron, which they wished to bring before the Lords of Council. This the young laird refused to permit, as being detrimental to his credit and that of the clan. Hence, taking the matter into his own hands, he himself adjudicated upon and settled the legal points in dispute between the parties; but he could not get them to agree upon the question of the witnesses' expenses. In this conjuncture, Sir John, rather than that he 'suld lat them lous again and be heard before ' the Council in sic idle and nochtie* actions, to their disgrace ' and their chief's also,' paid the expenses of the witnesses out of his own pocket.

Whether the litigants, after travelling so far for justice, relished this summary interference in their quarrel, may be open to question, but at least we know that the young laird's own legal conflicts had not a quite salutary effect upon his mind. A taste of successful litigation acts upon some individuals like the insane root that takes the reason prisoner; and Sir John appears to have been one of these. He entered into the possession of the family estates with every advantage; but his profuse and expensive mode of life, and his frequent and necessarily costly visits to Edinburgh, with his lawsuits there, so impaired his fortune that he was obliged to sell the estate of Lethen, one of his father's acquisitions, and hence had applied to him the sobriquet of 'Sir John Sell-the-Land.' His mother, the poetical Lady Liliass, came, however, to his assistance; and, 'considering the great burden of debt that ' my weil belovit son lies under, and I, as a maist loving and ' tender heartit mother, willing to help him by all the means ' I can,' renounced in his favour certain lands in Cromdale in which she had been infeft by her husband, reserving only the customs paid in kind for her life-rent use. This was not the only occasion on which she had to impoverish herself to relieve her son's distresses, for we find that, at a later period, she renounced other of her jointure-lands in his favour. 'Her ' love was laid' on 'one that had her heart,' in a deeper sense perhaps than that of her fine lyric—the love that many

* Puny, contemptible, a thing of naught.

waters cannot quench ; and not unlikely, as mothers will, she loved her unfortunate son more in the days of his adversity than in those of his success. He died seven years before herself. Let us hope the Lady Liliastoun in the evening of her life found in her books of devotion and her literary tastes some consolation for the whips and scorns of time.

An event of some historical interest in Sir John Grant's career was his obtaining in 1622 the gift of the escheat of Allan M'Randall of Lundie, the same who was in 1603 the leader of the Macdonalds in what has hitherto been known as the 'terrible raid of Gilliechrist.' The deed of gift throws a greatly softened light on a transaction which has been depicted by historians as one of the most barbarous of Highland reprisals, and as having been signalised by the basest and most revolting cruelty. In his account of the massacre of Glencoe, Macaulay has skilfully introduced the episode as illustrating the vindictive nature of the Highland clans. 'The Macdonalds of Glengarry,' he says, 'having been affronted by the people of a parish near Inverness, surrounded the parish church on a Sunday, shut the doors, and burned the whole congregation alive. While the flames were raging, the hereditary musician of the murderers mocked the shrieks of the perishing crowd with the notes of the bagpipe.' Other writers have added that those of the victims who escaped from the burning church were either mercilessly cut down by their assailants or thrust back into the flames. It is a matter of sincere satisfaction that we may now look upon this dreadful story as essentially a fabrication. From the terms of the deed of gift referred to, it appears that Lundie was charged with slaying at least four persons in Gilliechrist, besides burning and destroying twenty-seven dwelling-houses, with the barns, byres, and kilns belonging thereto, as also the 'hail librarie and buikes' of Mr. John Mackenzie, the Laird of Gilliechrist, in addition to stealing a number of horses, cows, and other live stock. No mention is made of the burning of a church or of any exceptional acts of cruelty, and the whole transaction resolves itself into a raid of the kind which was far from uncommon at that time, not only in the Highlands but on both sides of the Border. Set forth as it is, however, in the eloquent pages of Macaulay, the story will not be easily killed, and we may expect to see it revived from time to time in all its horrors.*

* History of England, vol. iii. p. 518. On the authority of Dr. Johnson ! Lord Macaulay has been equally unfortunate as regards the

Sir John Grant, at his death in 1637, left the estates greatly encumbered. For a few years before his death, moreover, the district of Strathspey had been much molested by bands of broken and lawless men of various clans, including that of Grant itself, and the laird had been called upon to act vigorously against them. To assist him in repressing these hordes, a commission was delivered to him from the Privy Council, empowering him to convocate the lieges and to seek and apprehend all lawless persons. Either his circumscribed means had hampered his movements, or he had become otherwise indisposed to act sharply against the wild clans, for he soon lost favour with the Council in the matter, and had no little trouble from them in consequence. When his son James succeeded to the estates in 1637, the commission does not appear to have been renewed, and indeed it would not have resulted in anything of importance to the peace of the country if it had. For James Grant was an utterly unstable and unprincipled man. His father, though unfortunate in the management of his estates, was a gentleman of honour and integrity; the son James was as fine a specimen of the trimming politician as is to be found in the history of Scotland in the seventeenth century—a century which was, by the way, rather more than remarkable for this type of Scottish aristocracy. For instance, James Grant, in 1640, took an active part along with Argyll, Montrose, and others in the cause of the Covenant; but, like the great Montrose himself, he turned recusant; and when, in February 1645, that general had the Highlands at his foot, Grant met him on his way to Elgin, tendered him his services, and immediately afterwards sent him a subsidiary force of three hundred men. 'But the men sent must have been but a 'ragged regiment,' for not many weeks after they had joined Montrose, the latter wrote to Grant, complaining of his men. 'Though,' said the Marquis, 'they were like to 'Jacob's days, they did not content themselves with that, 'but, bad and few as they were, have all played the run-

historical accuracy of his illustrations of Scotch severity cited in his account of the Glencoe massacre. Referring to the efforts of James V. to suppress the mostroopers of the Scottish Border, he describes 'how 'the chief of Henderland had been hung over the gate of the castle in 'which he had prepared a banquet for the king' (vol. iii. p. 521). Had he turned to Pitcairn's 'Criminal Trials,' instead of contenting himself with the traditional account in the notes to Scott's 'Border 'Minstrelsy,' the historian would have found that the 'chief of Henderland' was hanged in Edinburgh after the ordinary forms of trial.

‘aways.’ The men, in truth, like the laird their chief, had no great enthusiasm in Montrose’s work; and though the great soldier more than once wrote to stir up the laird into giving him more efficient help, nothing came of it. The laird was indeed at this time shuffling his cards preparatory to playing a new game. While towards the end of 1645 he sent renewed tokens of loyalty and offers of service to Queen Henrietta Maria and Prince Charles, and received from both in return grateful letters thanking him for his ‘great constancy and courage’ in the service of the King, we find him, within a few months after this, upon the most friendly terms with Major-General Middleton, the military commander for the Estates, and receiving from him a remission for himself, his friends, and tenants for the part they had taken with Montrose. He does not seem to have been implicated in the engagement for the delivery of Charles I. in 1648, though rumour at a later period connected him with the plot in support of the last attempt made by Montrose to restore the Royalist cause by force of arms. Again, he had in 1651 held a commission of infantry in the cause of Charles II.; and yet, immediately after the Restoration, he was threatened by the Lord Advocate with a charge of treason, on the ground that he had, while holding the said commission, basely given intelligence to the English, and received from them a warrant to have arms to keep his house against the enemy. Through the mediation of friends, however, no action was ultimately taken against him on this score, although he was afterwards classed among those who were excluded from the benefit of the Act of Indemnity until he should have paid a fine of 18,000*l.* Scots. Yet, strange to say, within less than a year from this time, James Grant’s name appears on a warrant by King Charles II., as one on whom his Majesty had resolved to confer a peerage, ‘special mention being made of the laird’s fidelity in following with his ‘friends and vassals the royal standard of Montrose’! After the ragged regiment of runaways, what would the great soldier, if he had been alive, have said to this? But fate was not so kind as the King to the slippery laird; for the death of the latter, in September 1663, before the peerage had been conferred, prevented the intention of the King from being carried out. In this way the laird escaped an honour which he did not merit.

While thus, by a hasty process of generalisation, painting James Grant of Freuchie in these disagreeable colours, we must take upon ourselves all responsibility for the result as

a portrait of the man. Mr. Fraser has indeed supplied us with the facts of the chief's conduct; but he in no case lifts up the heel against him. On the other hand, from the manner in which the laird is cited in the 'Introduction' as representative of 'a clan which have been long distinguished 'for devoted loyalty and attachment to their lawful sovereigns,' one might carry away the idea that this James Grant was among the most loyal of the loyal. This negation of criticism, this absence of enlightened characterisation, is somewhat to be regretted; as history, without a faithful and discriminative analysis of individual action, becomes at once colourless and unreal. We had already begun to feel it so when we stumbled upon this gyrating member of the family. The discovery of him was rather comforting than otherwise. Human nature knows what to expect of itself in the course of a few generations, and the story loses the charm of reality when nothing is found but a long succession of immaculately virtuous Highland chiefs—all Grants, and all good.

Yet James Grant of Freuchie, with all his political vagaries, was largely typical of the Scottish aristocracy of the seventeenth century. The historians of that period have occupied themselves so much with what was purely ecclesiastical and political, that they have lost the key to many of its most important movements. Nor will the bearings of events in that strangely distracted time ever be fully appreciated until more attention is given to the personal history and personal character of the great laymen who figured in its transactions. Much which is attributed to religious feeling and ecclesiastical custom will be found, when examined into, to have been in great part due to the personal bias and the class instincts of the aristocracy. To understand the actions we must first know and understand the actors; and this has not hitherto been sufficiently done. Even Mr. Gardiner, whose knowledge of that century is perhaps unsurpassed, sees nothing of the results of this personality except in the case of three or four of the chief movers among the Scottish aristocracy of the day. Other modern historians have been equally blind to the importance of the line of study which we here indicate. Aikman had neither the temper nor the means available for reckoning up the part which the aristocracy had in the struggle. Malcolm Laing set himself to follow out the polemical clue, and that only. Cook, while of broader sympathies and clearer views than any ecclesiastical historian since, was also too much disposed

to look at the whole matter from the clerical standpoint. Hill Burton, of whom other things might have been expected, failed likewise to see the part which the aristocracy played, and his enumeration of chiefs on either side of the controversy at different times is little other than a barren list of names, with no more personality attaching to them than if they had been so many algebraic symbols. Even amidst the vital throes of the nation in 1638, he is content to devote a whole chapter to the differences between the English Prayer-book and the Prayer-book issued by Laud, and many pages of other chapters to the discussion of the legal effects of 'protests,' 'suspensions,' and the like—work which was not historical, but archæological. He was satisfied to let the splendid pageantry of events in that time sweep by him unnoticed, so that he were left undisturbed in his task of chronicling the small beer of legal and liturgical antiquities. The same space devoted to the study of the aristocracy of that century, and of their relations to the King, the clergy, and the nation at large, would have led to results of the most interesting and vital kind. But the fact of Hill Burton's not having done so may be attributed in great part to his want of historical imagination—a faculty the presence of which is absolutely necessary in one who would seek to synchronise and fuse into one organic whole the varied and frequently hostile elements of that broken and discordant time. If such a study of the Scottish aristocracy of the seventeenth century be ever made, James Grant of Frauchie will by no means be left alone to bear the odium of recusancy and tergiversation.

The successor of James Grant was his son Ludovick, and with him its full measure of sturdy Highland independence was restored to the house of Grant. He was, in truth, a strong character, and worthily occupied, as chief of his clan, a position of the highest influence and authority in the North. A story is told illustrative of this. When James, Duke of York (afterwards James II. of England), was acting in Scotland as the King his brother's Commissioner, he was present at a meeting of the Scottish Parliament when Ludovick Grant demanded that his protest should be recorded against certain measures which had been proposed. His Royal Highness responded with the remark that 'the wishes of his Highland Majesty would be attended to.' In consequence of this sarcastic observation, Ludovick was afterwards popularly known as the 'Highland King,' and the designation was extended to his successors.

Laird Ludovick was a Covenanter, and suffered much from the severe acts against conventicles and the proceedings of the Covenanters generally. In 1685 he and his wife were fined by the King's Commissioners in no less a sum than 42,500*l.* Scots for keeping an unlicensed chaplain, and withdrawing from the ordinances of the prelatie clergy. On petitioning the King, however, for a remission of the fine, the prayer of the petition was, in January 1686, granted. This remission was probably due to the fact that in the interim the laird had acted promptly and loyally against the Duke of Argyll's ill-fated expedition of the previous year—a course of conduct which may have been dictated by an outspoken and pithy letter which he had received from Sir George Mackenzie, the Lord Advocate—the 'bluidy Mackenzie' of the Covenanters—and which was in the following terms:—

'Deare Coosen,—I conjure you to show your loyalty now or never ; upon it depends the family, which was very honorable before your time. Tak not the pett lyk a child, nor ill counsell lyk a foole, bot shew you(r) principles to be good and your interest to be considerable. Beleeve your Coosen,
'GEO. MACKENZIE.'

After the abdication of James II. and the establishment of the government of William III., the Laird of Grant was one of those who signed a congratulatory address to the latter King, and he was afterwards nominated by the Scottish Convention of Estates as one of a committee to consider the condition of the Highlands, and report. In the expedition of General Mackay against Claverhouse, the former censured the laird very severely for what he deemed his remissness in not holding the fords of Spey against Claverhouse ; but ultimately Grant rendered good service to Mackay, and appears to have been successful in removing any grudge which the general may at the first have entertained against him.

In the person of this laird's second son, Brigadier-General Alexander Grant, we are introduced to the abortive rebellion of 1715, and to a brief but somewhat close companionship with one of the most striking figures in that and the subsequent rising of '45, Simon Fraser of Beaufort, better known as Lord Lovat. The career of this extraordinary man, even when most prosaically narrated, can hardly fail to raise in the reader's mind the conception of a character more akin to the regions of fiction than of every-day life. He might have been a creation of some powerful historical dramatist, or have formed the central figure of some dark and bitter tragedy. The moving incidents of his life are striking enough in their

bare literalness, and require neither the imagination nor the embellishments of the novelist to heighten their effects.

'At one time,' says Burton, 'a mountain brigand, hunted from cave to cave; at another a laced courtier, welcomed by the first circle in Europe. In summer a powerful baron, with half a kingdom at his back; in winter dragged ignominiously to the block. By turns a soldier, a statesman, a Highland chief, a judge administering the law of the land, and, if tradition speaks truth, a Jesuit and a parish priest; uniting the loyal Presbyterian Whig with the Catholic Jacobite, and supporting both characters with equal success.'*

Any fresh light upon the character and proceedings of a man so curiously compounded is not to be lightly regarded; and in these volumes we have what Mr. Fraser believes to be the largest collection of his letters yet drawn together. And his letters have always afforded not the least striking and marvellous indications of the strange mental structure of the man; exhibiting him before us in all his powers of literary style and his versatility of intellectual resources, with his obsequious, almost mendacious, flattery of those whose favour he courted, and his unmeasured and rancorous abuse of all by whom he may have deemed himself offended or mistrusted. An unblushing hypocrite and an unhesitating liar, he regarded neither the rights of others nor the honour of himself. Yet honour is a word often in his mouth, mingling in all his high-sounding protestations of eternal fidelity at the very moment when he may be contemplating how easiest to prove false and betray. But his grandiloquence can rarely prevent the reader from noting that the man is playing a double part; that the flattery with which he greets some of his contemporaries is frequently hollow; and that the blame which he showers on others is in general the black result of hatred and prejudice.

In the first years of the century Lovat was an active Jacobite, and made more than one journey to France in behalf of the Stewarts. But in 1704, his good faith being suspected, he was arrested by the French King, and for nearly ten years detained a prisoner in France. During part of this time he is said to have held a cure in the Roman Catholic Church, and to have been a masked Jesuit. In 1714,

* Burton's 'Life of Lovat,' p. v. The annals of the Frasers of Philorth, compiled with great care by Lord Saltoun, with the assistance of Mr. Fraser, is another genealogical work due to his indefatigable industry, and it contains some valuable materials, especially the correspondence of General Lord Saltoun. But Lovat belonged to an entirely different branch of the Clan Fraser.

after paving his way by certain politic communications addressed directly and indirectly to the Duke of Argyll and other loyalists, he ventured back to London, but was there placed under arrest. In one of the letters which he had previously addressed from France to Brigadier-General Grant, dated Sept. 24, 1714, Lovat states, referring to the Duke of Argyll, that he had 'sent the bearer expressly to 'tell to your friend the Duke what I cannot commit to 'paper;' and adds, with the air of a man who is deep in Jacobite secrets and designs, 'that for some time he had been 'walking upon ice,' and that 'we will all be by the cars most 'assuredly, and every man will have need of his friends.' He then, swelling out into his best metaphorical style, takes up his parable of drover-life, and thus proceeds:—

'You know, sir, as well as I do, how conveniently my stock' [his clan] 'lies to drive to either side, or to hinder either side to drive, and I dare say, without vanity, that my cattle is as good as any of my neighbours, and that I lie in the centre of all the markets of the north' [the Highland clanships]; 'so that if the Duke puts me in a condition to trade, he will find that, joined with you and the others engaged in the company he is concerned in' [the Hanoverians], 'that I will over-ell the merchants who are against him' [the Jacobites], 'as much as any man can do. I own the matter is difficult, for these merchants are very powerful, and they lie so conveniently for trade that it's almost impossible to hinder them sending north their cattle and goods to what market they please; and since they are assured of English drovers' [the English Jacobites] 'to receive them, it will be very hard to hinder them. If you live, you will see what I tell you come to pass; and if great precautions be not taken, you and your neighbours will suffer more than any. Depend upon this advertisement; and I entreat you may use your interest with the Duke to clear my accounts, that I may go to consult with you how to carry on our trade. It is his Grace's interest as well as mine and yours, and he will most certainly find it so.'

However much we may dislike the man, and doubt the honesty of his intentions, it is impossible not to admire the literary skill with which he works out his meaning through his metaphor. And in his subsequent letters he fails not to identify the possibilities of his own liberation with the success of the Hanoverian cause. In a letter from Saumur, on the 29th September of the same year, he says that, 'though all possible appearance be for King George, yet 'there is a great storm that hangs over Scotland, and will 'break out sooner than people expects.' Hence he urges the Duke to obtain a 'full remission' for him, 'since my heart 'leads me to live and die with the Duke of Argyll and his 'family, whatever his fate may be.' Two months later he

avows himself 'the most unhappy of mankind,' in so far as that, having been 'barbarously treated as a Hanoverian by 'the Court of St. Germain's this twelve years,' his honesty should now be questioned by the Hanoverians at home:—

'It's a very desperate case,' he adds, 'but there is nothing but a stout heart to a stey brae. I did foresee all the scaffolds that could be before me, and that did not hinder me to venture my life to support my kindred and serve the family of Argyll. If they let me perish, it will be a triumph to the family of Athole and to the Mackenzies, which will be neither honourable nor advantageous to the family of Argyll.'

In other letters he professes, while lying in London, to be acquainted with all the movements of the Jacobites, who, he avers, are doing all in their power to oppose his obtaining a remission. Then this past and future Jacobite adds, in a tone of injured innocence, and with an effrontery that would seem positively audacious were it not amusing:—

'It's a strange matter that the Ministers of State should give ear to those who are known enemies to the Government, against a man that has already suffered for it, and who is ready to venture his life still for the maintaining of it, and that at a time when the kingdoms are like to swim in blood; for now, you may fully depend on it, that the Pretender will be over in the month of March next. . . . I wish I could go and put myself at the head of my clan; people would then know what I could do. But it's a hard matter to be kept close here and get nothing done.'

It was not, however, till October 1715 that Lovat obtained his release, and he about that time also received his remission, in response to a petition addressed to the King by Brigadier Grant and others of his friends in the North. The moment he regained his liberty he started for Scotland. After some adventures—for he seems to have met with adventures wherever he went—he arrived at length at Stirling; and here, instead of being met, as he expected, by the Duke of Argyll with 'open arms,' he was received by Brigadier Grant with an apologetic, though friendly, message from his Grace. Lovat thereafter proceeded to the North, where he called off his clans from the insurgent army, and, in company with eight hundred of the clan Grant and eleven hundred Munroes, took part in the reduction of Inverness.

We have thus seen Lovat in war; shortly we find him in love. From affection perhaps, but mainly at first, we suspect, from motives of policy, he came to the conclusion that it was desirable that he should connect himself in marriage with a family so powerful in the North as that of Grant.

Accordingly, he had fixed his attention upon Margaret, youngest daughter of Ludovick, Laird of Grant, and sister to Brigadier Grant. Mr. Fraser speaks of this love-affair as 'somewhat romantic.' The reverse seems to us to be the case. The lady was already in love with, if not actually affianced to, a son of Duff of Drumuire, and the marriage now projected between her and Simon Fraser was as completely the result of self-interested motives on the part of Lovat and her own brother as the most mercenary marriage that ever was made. It could not be forgotten moreover, either by the lady or her friends, that Lovat had formerly been charged with wickedly seizing upon the person of a widow lady closely related to his own house, and, from purely sordid motives, forcing her, in circumstances of great cruelty, into a kind of marriage with him—for which crime he had been convicted in absence before the High Court of Justiciary, and outlawed. The story was too scandalous and too damaging to Lovat's character in the Highlands to be readily overlooked, more especially as the lady upon whom he had committed such violence was still alive. Hence it is not surprising to find that the three married sisters of the young lady were all opposed to the match with Lovat; and possibly the Brigadier would have been so too, but for the fact that the Duke of Argyll and his brother, Lord Islay, were both interested in Lovat's behalf, and both pressing strongly for the marriage. It was most desirable, in the eyes of the Duke, that the two powerful families of Grant and Fraser should be thus connected; and he was so much enamoured of the 'policy' of the marriage that he even spoke to the King to hasten it on. In the words of the Duke's brother, 'it was a measure settled for the better uniting our interest in the North.' Between the Duke, the Duke's brother, and the King, it was resolved that the young lady should be sacrificed to their wishes, and that Lovat, with his ugly face, his uncouth person, his tarnished honour, his profligate life, and his scandalous reputation, should become her husband. 'Somewhat romantic' indeed!

The marriage negotiations afforded Lovat a splendid field for the display of his undoubted epistolary talents, more especially as the lady's sisters were far from allowing him to get things all his own way. He took up the character of a high-minded, disinterested lover, only seeking for the match out of pure affection for the lady and her family, and averring that his devotion to the latter should never vary, let

the match go how it might. But we must let him state his view of the situation in his own way. In one of his magnificent-magnanimous moods he writes to Brigadier Grant, that, 'come of the match what will, it will never augment or diminish my zealous friendship for your person and interest; and if I live, I hope to be as useful to you and yours as the bourgeois lairds whom your relations have preferred to me, after their encouraging promises to assist my design several months ago.' Then he breaks out on the 'bourgeois lairds,' that is, the rival and his friends:—

'I cannot but laugh, dear Brigadier, to see the nature of these common fellows when they see themselves masters of a good estate. Drumuire's words are rather like Louis Quatorze than like William Duff's son. He makes no apology for not acquainting you of his son's design, which he calls resolution, *le Roi l'a resolu*; and then it is not by way of entreating he asks your consent, but by way of commanding. He says he expects it without loss of time. He could not write otherwise to one of his vassals on Speyside; but I must own I never saw anything more pointedly answered than you have done that insolent paragraph.'

After this he is still more indignant at what he considers the double-dealing of some of the lady's friends, and comes to the pious conclusion that if the marriage fails it is through no fault of his, 'so we must let Providence take its course.' 'I would have preferred,' he says again, and the confession is interesting as coming from a man who had been publicly tried as the principal desperado in a forced marriage—'I would have preferred your sister to any lady in Britain that I could pretend to, so, on the other hand, I would rather marry her chambermaid than marry her contrary to her inclination; for if there is not a mutual inclination in that liferent bond, it must be a curse rather than a blessing.' Commonplace as the latter sentiment is, it sounds strangely from the lips of Lovat.

The marriage negotiations came to an end at last, and the ceremony was performed in December 1716. The couple lived more than twelve years together, and when the union was at that period dissolved by the lady's death, her husband indulged in the strongest manifestations of grief. From these and other indications we are disposed to think that the marriage was, after all, not altogether unhappy; and although one can hardly without suspicion see Lovat going into hysterics, yet, upon the whole, we are inclined to believe that his overpowering grief at her death was sincere. Five years afterwards he made a second marriage—not, again, without

many difficulties being in the way ; but this, according to his own letters, was a most unhappy union, and the couple eventually separated. Lovat's letters on the subject of this second marriage—the courtship, the married life, and the separation—are as curious as anything hitherto published in the annals of amatory or connubial correspondence. His own career terminated on the scaffold in 1746 for his share in the rebellion of the previous year.

In 1716 Brigadier Grant succeeded to the headship of the clan on the death of his father, whose eldest son had predeceased him. Throughout the insurrection of 1715 the Brigadier did good service to the Government, and he afterwards continued faithful to the Hanoverian cause. But his services to the Crown were not recompensed as might have been expected. In consequence of some 'vote' which the Brigadier had given in relation to Lord Cadogan, but the nature of which is not explained, he received in July 1716 a curt intimation of dismissal from the service. The note was from the Secretary at War :—

'Sir,—I won't be very long on a subject that is not very agreeable to me, for I must acquaint you that his Majesty has no further occasion for your services.—I am,' &c.

It is not every Highland castle that such a note would have arrived at in the first half of the eighteenth century without immediately converting a loyal Hanoverian into a pronounced Jacobite. But whatever the Laird of Grant may have felt over his dismissal, he made no breach with the Government, and his successor lived to maintain the loyalty of the family when Highland hearts were again tampered with in 1745. On this latter occasion the chief of the clan was the Brigadier's brother, Sir James Grant. In the August of that year he was honoured with a letter from Prince Charles's own hand, soliciting his support in flattering terms. But the old man, who was in London at the time, returned no answer to the letter, and left affairs at home to be managed by his son, afterwards Sir Ludovick. The latter was true to the government, in so far as he did not join the ranks of the insurgents ; but his interest in the Royal cause was lukewarm. He had offered his services at an early period to Sir John Cope, and had been offended by the cold manner in which his offer was received ; hence he resolved not to march south to the assistance of the reigning King, but to remain at home, and use his clan, if need were, for the protection of his and their property. It would be of

little interest to follow the fortunes of the family further, except to say that a grandson of Sir Ludovick's succeeded in 1811, not only to the estates of Grant, but also, as heir-general to his cousin, to the title and estates of the fourth Earl of Seafield. In this manner the distinctive appellation of Chief of the Grants became merged in the higher title of Seafield, the holder of which title is now head of the ancient clan.*

In arranging his materials Mr. Fraser has followed his usual plan, which, when dealing with such a mass of documents as is here presented, is perhaps the best possible. The first volume contains an historical statement in which the fortunes of the family are sketched from its rise to the date of publication, with an appendix containing the genealogy in tabulated form and in useful detail. The second is filled with letters and other forms of correspondence found in the family archives. The third is devoted to the reproduction in full of the text of the family charters, leases, and other deeds, mostly of a technical kind. In this last volume there is of course much which is of no great public utility, but which cannot be objected to in a book printed for private family purposes. The second volume is one of much interest, containing as it

* Since the above was written, the death of Ian-Charles, eighth Earl of Seafield, by which the promising career of an amiable and accomplished nobleman was cut short at the early age of thirty-three, has resulted in something like a crisis in the history of the Grant family. The deceased Earl, never having been married, was succeeded by his paternal uncle, the Hon. James Grant. From motives into which we cannot enter here, the late Earl had made a will by which the whole of the extensive estates of Grant and Seafield were left absolutely to his mother, the Countess-Dowager, in fee simple, thus dispossessing his successor, and divorcing the title from the lands that formerly appertained to it. The lady upon whom the property was thus settled is a daughter of the noble house of Blantyre, whose surname is Stuart; so that, by the terms of the late Earl's will, the Stuarts would have inherited the ancient property of the Grants. This extraordinary diversion of the patrimony from its original destination has, however, been prevented by the Countess-Dowager, who has executed a settlement, which came into immediate operation, by which she retains the lands during her own lifetime, granting 4,000*l.* a year to the holder of the title. At her death the lands will return to the holder of the title, with the sole proviso that no part of them shall be sold during the lifetime of the present Earl or the immediate successor to the title. After the death of the present Earl and his immediate successor the lands will be restored to the Earldom unconditionally, and the holder of the title once more enjoy the united honours of Grant and Seafield.

does the correspondence of the family from 1534 downwards. It is divided into three sections, the first being royal letters and warrants, of which there are thirteen in all, dating from 1534 to 1715, but which have no special value. The second section is made up of fifty-three state and official letters, 1569-1746, and is decidedly of more importance. But the great mass of the volume is formed by the third section, which embraces the family letters from 1573 onwards. These are of much interest and value, especially for the seventeenth and eighteenth century history, and include many letters that cannot fail to afford substantial help to the historians of the future. The Lovat letters are themselves a mine of historical and biographical wealth, and will form a splendid mass of information to any future biographer who may attempt to repeat anew the story of that singular man.

It is not necessary in the space at our command to attempt to give anything like an adequate review of the material thus made available for historical and genealogical purposes; but there is one document, perhaps the most curious and important within the three volumes, which it is impossible to pass over in silence. This is an instrument preserved at Castle Grant, in which an account is officially given of the election of a minister of a parish in pre-Reformation times, and which bears so pointedly upon the fact that the sheep even in those times chose their shepherd, that, but for the different forms of worship, it might almost be supposed to belong to the second quarter of the present century instead of the first half of the sixteenth. The parish in which the election took place was that of Duthie, and the date of the transaction was January 13, 1547.

‘The parishioners (whose names are given in detail) assembled in the church, and the applicant for the vacant clerkship, Mr. Andrew Grant, appeared before them requesting their suffrages. The parishioners unanimously gave him their support, and during the celebration of high mass, which followed, he proceeded to the altar-step, and in a loud voice requested the parishioners who consented to his election to stand up. Upon this, says the notary who recorded the proceedings, everyone in the church rose, so that I saw no one sitting, and all with one voice exclaimed, We choose Mr. Andrew Grant to be our parish clerk of Duthie, and no other, unless we are compelled to the contrary by James, Laird of Grant, and if we should be so compelled by the said James to elect another, we will that last election to be null and void to anyone accepting it, inasmuch as it could not be called election, but compulsion.’

Then follows the formal sanction given by the Dean of Moray to the election, the parishioners being admonished by

him, 'under pain of excommunication, to pay the dues and 'rights of the clerkship to Mr. Andrew Grant, and to no 'other.'

That declaration—'inasmuch as it could not be called 'election, but compulsion'—has the true Disruption ring. What a flutter it would have occasioned could such a precedent have been flung into the hostile camps of Moderates and Evangelicals fifty years ago! Had Mr. Fraser but discovered it half a century sooner, it may be safely affirmed that, if his name did not appear almost as a household word in Buchanan's 'Ten Years' Conflict,' it would otherwise have been, like that of Hugh Miller, only rendered conspicuous by its absence.

In the course of his labours among the Grant muniments, Mr. Fraser has been able to collect some valuable information regarding the systems under which lands were anciently held in the Highlands, and which information is of especial interest at present when the waters of public opinion are being so strongly moved on the matter. Referring to the fact that recent writers have asserted that 'chiefs of clans 'took advantage of their tenants and vassals and reduced them 'from being with their chiefs co-proprietors of the soil to the 'position of mere landless men,' Mr. Fraser says :—

'The historical possessions of the Grant family, far from having been taken by force from their dependants, were acquired by purchase, or by gifts from the Crown in return for services rendered to the State. On the other hand, the clan, composed of the younger descendants of the family, and, it may be also, natives of the soil who assumed the name of Grant, had never any other claim to the Grant estates than what was conferred by the nature of the tenures under which they held their respective possessions from successive lairds. These tenures were chiefly wadsets and leases.'

In the matter of wadsets, we gather from Mr. Fraser that this mode of holding, on the Grant estates at least, appeared to have been inaugurated by John, fifth laird of Freuchie, who succeeded to the estates before 1586. Extensive purchase of estates required money, and when the laird wished to raise money for that and other purposes, the wadset offered a convenient form of doing so. The wadset was, indeed, of the nature of a mortgage, but it provided that the lands disposed should be held by the holder of the wadset and his descendants until the laird or his successors repaid the sums advanced and thereby redeemed the territory. The amount of money lent on wadset was commonly no more than a sum of which the annual interest would equal the valued rental of

the land. This served a twofold object: no rent required to be paid on the one hand, and no interest on the other.

‘While the wadset remained unredeemed the holder of it was practically the proprietor of the lands. He was considered a lesser baron, and he could elect, and be himself elected, to serve in Parliament. He was designated by the name of the lands. He sublet the whole or portions of them to tenants and cottars, who became his servants. They paid their rents and rendered services to him, and were controlled by him without reference to the actual feudal proprietor. This system saved much trouble in dealing with a numerous tenantry. But it had disadvantages which outweighed any supposed benefit. During the progress of the country, and the advance in the value of land, the benefit accrued, not to the real owner, but to the holder of the wadset.’

As an instance of the long duration of wadsets, Mr. Fraser mentions that the Grants of Tullochgorm, who in 1614 obtained for 2,000*l.* Scots a wadset of a portion of land on the banks of the Spey, which bore that name, were designated therefrom the Grants of Tullochgorm, and continued to hold the lands in wadset until the year 1777. By the families holding such wadsets the lands, after long continuance in their hands, came to be regarded as a kind of ancestral possession, and hence it was frequently with the utmost reluctance that they consented to its redemption by the chiefs, preferring rather to pay large annual feu-duties and other burdens which the rise in value of the lands may have fairly demanded, so that they might thereby obtain a prorogation of the redemption of the wadset. In the case of the Grants of Tulloch this was twice done; and the same favour was conceded in other cases also. Sir James Grant towards the end of last century discontinued the practice, and emancipated himself from the ‘gentlemen wadsetters,’ as they were called. The system of wadsetting was not confined to Strathspey, but was from early times a recognised form of tenure in different parts of Scotland, and continued down to a later date in Argyleshire and the Isles. When the system was discontinued, mortgages took the place of wadsets. Feus, in the Highlands, were of later origin.

Next to the wadset, the tack or lease was the other form of land tenure most in vogue in the north of Scotland. Under these leases the lands were let, in one or more forms, to tenants for a stated number of years in return for a fixed annual rent. The rent was rarely, if ever, paid in money only, but generally consisted of part money and part grain, with what were known as the customs paid in kind, such as butter, sheep, hogs, hens, capons, peats, linen, yarn, &c.,

according to the products of the district. In general these 'customs' have now been commuted into a fixed money payment.

Those interested in the subject of land tenure in the Highlands of Scotland will discover in the leases and kindred documents printed in these volumes many important facts bearing upon the question, and throwing light upon the relations that anciently subsisted between the chief and his people; while the student of Scottish history generally will, as we have already indicated, find among the records here drawn together not a little that will strike him as of permanent value for the elucidation of the sixteenth and seventeenth century annals.

ART. IV.—*Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII., preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere in England.* Arranged and catalogued by JAMES GAIRDNER, Assistant Keeper of the Public Records, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, and with the sanction of her Majesty's Secretary of State. Vols. VI. and VII. London: 1882-83.

IN an article on the Divorce of Catharine of Aragon, published July 1880, in reviewing the first part of the fourth volume of the Spanish Calendar, we gave some account of the state of affairs from May 1529 down to the end of the year 1530. We now take up the thread of the history from that point.

The beginning of the year 1531 was in many respects a critical period in the history of the divorce of Catharine. The death of Margaret of Savoy, the regent of the Netherlands and aunt of the Emperor, December 1, 1530, had removed one of the parties nearly interested in the case. Wolsey had died on the preceding November 29, and we need not now speculate on the influence he might have exerted if his life had been prolonged, or whether he would ever have regained the place in Henry's affections from which he had been ousted by the fascination of Anne Boleyn over the king, and her hatred for himself. His death left the way clear for Cromwell, whose project to 'make or mar' was now to begin to operate. Henry had not yet taken the bit between his teeth, but he was determined to show his teeth. He had not yet absolutely resolved to break with Rome, but he meant to show that if he could not get rid of Catharine

with the pope's concurrence, he would find some other means of doing it. The case had already lasted more than three years, but no one would have prophesied that it would still be prolonged for an equal period longer, as we know it was. But as yet there was no open breach with the queen. The year 1530 had been spent in gaining by wholesale bribery the opinions of French and Italian Universities, as well as those of individual jurists and theologians of repute : Croke, Cranmer, Stokesley, and others had been employed in this work, and they had managed to secure seven foreign as well as the two English Universities on Henry's side. It is true, the opinions given had been on the supposition of the consummation of the first marriage, but the king was already quite prepared to perjure himself as regards this point. The virginity of Catharine at the time of her second marriage is abundantly proved from a variety of documents which have lately come to light, and it was an important element in the case. The king had himself admitted it in former days both to the emperor and others, and now he could only defend himself from the charge of having asserted it, by alleging that he was joking, and that a man must not be taken for asserting the exact truth in convivial moments. The opinions of the Universities of Orleans, Paris, Angers, Bruges, Bologna, Padua, and Toulouse, had been printed with a view to the copy being exhibited in Parliament, and the Public Record Office contains numerous treatises on the subject written in the same sense, and intended to fortify these determinations. Amongst these treatises, some of which extend to two or three hundred leaves, is one of a single page in Cranmer's hand, with additions in the king's hand, containing 'a judgment that the marriage between Prince Arthur and Princess Catharine was consummated.' Of course the Spanish universities are conspicuous by their absence. Perhaps it may be as well to remind the reader that the original object of collecting these opinions was, to fortify the pope in deciding, as it was hoped he would decide, against the validity of the marriage of the king with Catharine. But the use they are now to be put to is to represent the strength of the case against a possible determination of the pope the other way. This was Cromwell's suggestion, not Cranmer's, as has been erroneously supposed. But as yet the king and the pope were coquetting with each other, and Henry was urging the pope to make Ghinucci, Bishop of Worcester, and Casale, Bishop of Belluno, cardinals, to strengthen his influence at the Court of Rome, and was doing

his best to bribe the other cardinals with offers of preferment. The cause had been advoked to Rome, and the whole of this and the following year was wasted in discussions as to whether Dr. Edward Carne should be admitted as excusator, to plead that the pope had no right to summon the king to Rome either in person or by proxy.

Meanwhile the king had entirely failed to gain the Lutherans to his side. But every effort was made to secure the Cardinal of Ancona, 'the old man' as he is called in the correspondence of the day, to distinguish him from his nephew of the same name, the Cardinal of Ravenna, who was designated as 'the young man.' Peter de Accoltis, now nearly eighty years of age, was the only surviving cardinal who had advised Julius II. in the matter of that celebrated dispensation for the marriage of Henry with his brother's widow, containing the clause *forsan cognitam*, and it was pretty well known at Rome and shrewdly suspected elsewhere, that Clement would not venture to fly in the face of his opinion, which, as was well known, had never varied. A general council was being freely talked about, and great efforts were being made by the French and English sovereigns to transfer the case to Cambray.

An Italian named Mario Savorgnano had arrived in England at the beginning of August, and by the interest of Marco Rafael, a renegade Jew, then in great favour with the king for helping on the divorce by his writings, he was presented to the king, who, we are told, embraced him joyously. This man describes the king as living with a young woman of noble birth, though, as many said, of bad character. He confirms all that the imperial and Venetian ambassadors say of the popularity of the queen, who had only in the preceding month been ordered off from Windsor by Henry. He afterwards saw Catharine at the More, where, strangely enough, he describes her as always having a smile on her countenance. He then visited the Princess Mary at Richmond. They both received him as if nothing amiss were going on. The princess probably knew the state of affairs at court almost as well as the queen, who had now for some months feared that Henry would marry the woman with whom he was leading a shameless life, as Catharine herself, April 5, 1531, had told the emperor. But though she had now been dismissed from court, she was careful not to make a display of her grief, and probably had instructed the princess to keep a good face on the matter, in hopes that the catastrophe might yet be averted. She did not think as yet that her

husband would immediately act in direct opposition to the inhibitory breve which had been issued by Clement VII. on January 5, 1531. That was the second actual public demonstration the pope had made. In it he represents that the queen had signified the danger there was that Henry might proceed to a second marriage before any decision should have been arrived at as regards that which subsisted between the king and herself, and he peremptorily forbids any such marriage under the penalty of excommunication; but no mention is as yet made of Anne Boleyn individually, or of any supposed improper connexion with any woman, though the king is directed by the breve to treat the queen with all conjugal affection. It was, in fact, a mere repetition of a previous breve of March 7, 1530, the only difference being that the second breve implies that it had come to the pope's knowledge that the king was intending to have the cause tried in his own dominions, and without recognising the pope's authority. It is a remarkable fact that no copies of either of these breves exist in the Public Record Office, and that Mr. Gairdner in his *Calendar* refers to Le Grand's printed copy, whilst the editor of the '*Records of the Reformation*' knew only of this copy, and the imprint made of it in the '*Exemplaria sive Copiæ Trium Brevium Apostolicorum*,' &c., published at Rome in 1533. The state of affairs was widely different when the third of these breves was issued on January 25, 1532. In this Clement rebuked Henry for having for two years past changed from having been an observant son of the Church to a line of conduct which disregarded his paternal injunctions, by separating himself from the queen, and cohabiting with a certain lady named Anna, as he had been informed by trustworthy witnesses, and ordered him to dismiss the lady and receive Catharine again, and grant her all the privileges of a wife, until a definitive sentence should be pronounced. But even this third breve was suspended, its execution not taking place till November 5, 1532, when the pope added that, as there had been no cessation of the cohabitation with Anne Boleyn, he warned the king, that if after one month of the reception of the breve he did not comply, he would be excommunicated. The copies were posted up at Dunkerque and Bruges on the following January 21 and 23 respectively. But before this time the marriage with Anne had actually been solemnised; for we have not much doubt that the original date assigned for the ceremony, viz. St. Erkenwald's Day, November 14, 1532, is the correct one.

The same story might have been told for any time during these two years, that an unknown correspondent, writing from Rome to the Duke of Mantua, April 3, 1532, related. He says: 'At this court there are now but two matters to write about, the Turkish invasion, and the English divorce case.' Six months later it was one of the ostensible, though certainly not one of the real, causes of the meeting of Francis and Henry at Calais and Boulogne, to provide for the possible contingency of the Turk forming some fresh plan of attack against the nations of Christendom, for which purpose an agreement was signed at Calais on October 28, 1532, in the 18th year of the most Christian king and the 24th of that of the 'Defender of the Faith,' that

'they would muster 80,000 men and oppose the Turk with all their power, and that they would send express to the princes of Germany and Italy to concede passage to such their army, both going and returning, as it is a question of so holy and necessary a work, affecting the common weal and defence of the whole Christian religion; begging them also to unite their forces with those of France and England, remembering that it was possible the said Turk might become so powerful in Christendom that the forces mustered by these two nations might be insufficient, so that Christendom might remain at the mercy of the common enemy.'

The agreement, no doubt, was never meant to come to anything, inasmuch as its execution was made to be dependent on a subsequent advance of the Turk after a retreat which had been announced to the two kings since their first meeting, and for which the two Christian princes express their fervent gratitude to Almighty God. The meeting, however, was intended to show the world the agreement of the two princes, and to answer any charge that might be made against them, as if in opposing the pope and the emperor they were neglectful of the interests of Christendom. But the main object of the meeting on Henry's part turned out a failure, for he did not succeed in getting the French king to be present at the marriage ceremony. The meeting had, we cannot doubt, been arranged for that express purpose, and that failing, it was no longer thought advisable to delay the ceremony, which no doubt took place, as we have said, on St. Erkenwald's Day, November 14, 1532. The plan of operations had been already settled. Archbishop Warham had died August 24. Catharine had previously been dismissed from court, and two of Henry's most unscrupulous agents, Lee and Gardiner, promoted to the sees of York and Winchester respectively. Within two days of Warham's

death, the Venetian ambassador had heard the rumour that Cranmer was destined to be his successor, though it was not till five weeks afterwards that Cranmer was summoned home from the imperial court. Anne had been made Marchioness of Pembroke, September 1.

During the whole of this period various rumours were floating about. At one time she was to be created a duchess, at another she was said to be pregnant, and this is the most common report, and occasionally it is whispered that the marriage had already taken place; but it is plain from the despatches from England, France, and Rome, that no one in either country believed the intercourse between her and the king to be innocent.

As early as February 23, 1533, it was known, so Capello informs the Signory, that immediately upon the arrival of the bulls for the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury, the divorce case will be terminated whether the pope assents or not. And the assertion is repeated, March 7, that 'in a few days the divorce case will be decided in Parliament, and they merely await from Rome the bulls for the Archbishop of Canterbury, which will arrive after Easter, and his Majesty will espouse the Marchioness Anne.'

Such was the state of affairs, as it appeared to lookers on, at the beginning of the year 1533, the date at which the documents analysed in the two volumes whose titles are placed at the head of this article commence. We have scarcely alluded to Mr. Gairdner's preceding volume, which runs over the period of the two preceding years which bridge over the interval between our last and our present article, and we have made but little use of it; but we must not pass it by without noticing the remarkable series of despatches of Eustace Chapuys, which occupy so large a portion of the volume. They continue the history of the court and the queen, and when read with those which appeared in the volume which we reviewed in July 1880, and those which we proceed now to notice, give the best picture that has ever been drawn of transactions at court from September 1, 1529, down to the end of the year 1534.

Assuredly we cannot complain that the events of these two years, to each of which a volume has been assigned, are at all wanting in interest. Neither have we a fault to find with the mode of execution of the analyses. On the contrary, in the first of the two volumes we find some important corrections of documents and explanations of mistaken allusions in such letters as had been previously analysed by Don Pascual de

Gayangos, and we can only hope that this latter editor may profit by experience and consult the last of these two volumes whenever he finds himself at a loss in the common ground which he will have to traverse in his forthcoming volume of Spanish papers. The two series of papers, with some important additions from the Venetian Calendar, complete, in all probability, all that will ever be known of this eventful period, unless, indeed, the National Library at Paris should supply additional information hereafter. It is somewhat to be regretted that few State papers from that repository have as yet been published, and that the few that appear in *Le Grand* are so full of errors of transcription.

We need not allude further to Mr. Gairdner's fifth volume, as we shall have enough to do to compress our notice of the sixth and seventh, which we have placed at the head of this article, if we are to confine it within any reasonable limits. It will be sufficient to say that the despatches of Chapuys contained in it are of the highest interest, and entirely confirm the impression left on the mind of the reader after perusing the despatches of the preceding fifteen months. The meekness and resignation of Catharine, and the love universally bestowed on her by the people of England, are borne witness to throughout, and it is important to observe that the Venetian ambassador's despatches entirely confirm this view of the case. Both these ambassadors speak of the contempt with which Anne Boleyn was commonly regarded. Both these points, together with the development of character of savage cruelty in Henry, and the diabolical malice of Anne Boleyn, are well illustrated throughout.

During the interval from December 1530 to January 1533, Henry's treatment of the queen was going from bad to worse, and all the time was occupied at Rome with debates, not touching the cause itself, but discussing the technical difficulty whether Dr. Edward Carne, who appeared in the name of the people of England, and without a commission from the king, should be admitted as excusator—that is, as an advocate to plead that the king was exempted from the necessity of appearing, either in person or by proxy, in a court held out of his dominions.

At the beginning of 1533, the pope and the emperor were both at Bologna; the talk was of a general council, which Clement dreaded but reluctantly consented to, at the suggestion of the emperor, who would not perhaps have objected to Cambray, though the pope was bent on its being held in Italy. There was also a project for the meeting of the pope

and the King of France, which took place in the following November. Here, too, were the cardinals of Tournon and Grammont, representing the French king, who wrote to Francis that the meeting was to be kept secret from the emperor. All things seemed to conspire towards a delay of the sentence. Francis was doing what he could for Henry, and there was an understanding between the pope and the Most Christian King, as a marriage between his son Henry, Duke of Orleans, and the pope's niece, was already on the *tapis*. The queen was perfectly well aware, as was everybody in England as well as elsewhere, that the decision, whenever given, must necessarily be in her favour; but there was the utmost dread lest that decision should be put off, as it had been now for so many years delayed. As early as March 1533, it was well known and avowed that a marriage had taken place at some time or other, for Henry had instructed his ambassador in France to announce the fact to Francis, and request his assistance in persuading the pope and cardinals to be satisfied with what he had done, and to gain to his side as many of the cardinals as he could in case the pope should be against him, so as to prevent his holiness attempting anything against it in future. Both sides were still depending on the pope, the king hoping against hope that he might be brought to countenance his proceedings, and the queen knowing very well that that would not be so, yet fearing what actually came to pass, that Henry would adopt another course and have the marriage with herself cancelled in spite of all that pope or cardinals, the Consistory or the Rota, should determine. Meanwhile, everything was arranged for Cranmer to decide the case at as early a day as possible. Chapuys was aware that they were waiting only for the bulls for the consecration to arrive, and before the end of March they had arrived, and Cranmer, on March 30, 1533, was consecrated by the Bishops of Lincoln, Exeter, and St. Asaph, Longland, Voysey, and Standish, taking the usual oath of canonical obedience to the pope, which he had that same morning deliberately protested before witnesses that he did not mean to keep. On April 5, the Convocation of Canterbury had prepared the way by their determination that the pope had no dispensing power in the case of a marriage having been consummated to allow a brother to marry his brother's widow, and also that, in matter of fact, the marriage between Arthur and Catharine had been consummated. On April 9, Catharine was informed that further resistance was useless, for the marriage had already taken place more than two months

before, by the Dukes of Norfolk and Surrey, the Marquis of Exeter (not Dorset, as Don Pascual de Gayangos suggests), and the Earl of Oxford. On April 11, Cranmer wrote the two celebrated letters to the king, one of which appears to have been rejected and the other accepted, in which he humbly beseeches him to allow him to determine his great cause of matrimony, as belongs to the archbishop's spiritual office, as 'much bruit exists among the common people on 'the subject.' Of the 'much bruit' we hear a good deal in these papers, and it was plainly not of a kind to commend itself to the king and his obsequious slave, the newly consecrated Primate of All England.

The day before this the imperial ambassador had had a stormy interview with the king, in which he had remonstrated with him in terms which no subject would have dared to use, but in using which he was protected by his right as an ambassador. The king replied to him in a sort of fury that it was of no use to argue, for he had quite made up his mind to have the matter decided at home. The day after Cranmer had written the letter, Anne Boleyn went to mass in royal state. This was Saturday, Easter Eve, April 12, and three days later Eustace Chapuys wrote to be recalled, as it was supposed that war with the emperor would be the result, and if he did not depart, it might be thought that the emperor was a consenting party to the new marriage, and Chapuys was of opinion that the courier despatched to Rome on that day was instructed to intimate to the pope that what had been done against him in Parliament had been at the solicitation of the people, and not at his own, and that if the new marriage should be sanctioned by the pope everything would be revoked. This of course is Chapuys' opinion, and we have no means of judging how far he was correct in thus judging.

It is plain enough that he thought it probable that it would lead to war between the emperor and the King of England. His letters are full of suggestions of the kind. He reminds the emperor of what is due to the unfortunate queen, his aunt, into whose inmost confidence he seems to have been taken. He assures him that there would be no difficulty in raising half England to assist him in behalf of the outraged lady who was cherished and almost adored by the people of England; and the more so because they were so exasperated against Anne Boleyn, who was spoken of as a common prostitute, and despised and hated by high and

low. We might have thought this an exaggerated representation, for, of course, Chapuys was not altogether an impartial witness. But the same state of feeling is testified to by the Venetian ambassador, who can scarcely be accused of any partisanship, and whose business it was to represent to the Doge and Senate all he could find out, in the most exact way possible. Carlo Capello expresses himself pretty much in the same way as Eustace Chapuys. Writing early in March he also says that in a few days the divorce case will be decided in Parliament, by which, probably, he means Convocation, and that they are merely waiting for the bulls from Rome to arrive for the marriage with the Marchioness Anne to take place, which will be after Easter. About a month later he informs the Signory how the imperial ambassador had rated the king *molto altamente*. As regards the marriage, on April 2 he says he is assured that his majesty espoused the lady some months ago, and that she bore him a son who is several months old. The same story of the affection of the people of England for their queen is told by Giustiniani, the Venetian ambassador at the court of France, as related to him by Sir John Wallop, viz. that the queen was beloved as if she had been of the blood royal of England, and the princess in like manner, adding that should the divorce take place the king will be at war with the emperor and with Scotland.

Carlo Capello thinks that the queen will be demanded by the emperor, but in this he was mistaken. But though the emperor never intended making war with England on behalf of his aunt, unless it should be for his own interest to do so, it is evident that there were great fears entertained both as to the probability of an invasion and also as to the attitude of the English people. Both these points are almost new, English historians appearing to be in entire ignorance as regards them. Chapuys, writing on April 27, says that the queen had been already cited to appear at Dunstable, a place which had been selected because of its being solitary, and in order that the people might be kept from talking about it or rioting, as they might do if the case were tried in London. We need not go through the history of the mock trial at Dunstable, which began on May 10, after the public appearance of Anne Boleyn had taken place. No new light is thrown upon the proceedings of the court, nor was it to be expected, as, of course, the foreign ambassadors were not present, and the letters relating to the case have been printed for the most part in the State papers issued under

the Commission of 1830, and in other publications. But though Chapuys could not be present at the court, and had advised the queen to have nothing to do even in protesting against its jurisdiction, he took good care to protest beforehand in the emperor's name, and forwarded his protest to the king some days before its first session. He was almost thought to have exceeded his instructions as an ambassador in doing this, but his boldness in a subsequent conversation two days afterwards at the council-board is very remarkable, and he reminded the councillors that they knew well how easy it was in this country to disseminate dissensions, that heretofore the Roses had troubled the kingdom, and now it seemed they desired to sharpen the thorns of the roses. As regards the transactions of the court, and the foregone conclusion it was set up to promulgate, there is only one document of any importance. It is the letter in which Crammer informs Cromwell, May 17, that the matter was kept as secret as possible, lest the Lady Catharine should appear, and so the process be delayed; and from this private letter we gather that Crammer was quite aware that the bruit and voice of the common people was not, as in his hypocritical letter to the king he had implied, in favour of his cause, but that, on the contrary, he thought it might move the queen to appear and protest, which, 'peradventure, she would not do if she shall hear little of it.' We do not, however, profess to dwell upon any evidence as to Crammer's character, or any other point except what is now, for the first time, revealed in these papers.

As regards the probability of the emperor's making war upon Henry, it is plain, from Chapuys' despatches, that there was great and real fear in England, and very little reason indeed for such fear. Even when the marriage had become commonly known, Charles urged his ambassador to keep on the most friendly terms possible with the king and council, and it appears that the king and council repeatedly asked Chapuys whether there was any likelihood of war on account of the case. His reply on one occasion was remarkable, as he ventured to express his hope that what a French king had before done might be again enacted now, viz. that an English king might be induced to follow his example, and repudiate the second marriage by taking his first wife into favour again. Whether the imperial ambassador thought this probable or possible, he at any rate got out of the present difficulty, and excused his master from the necessity of avenging his aunt the queen, without committing himself

to an avowal of the legitimacy of the marriage with Anne Boleyn. And the queen herself so far seconded Charles's selfish advice that she should not leave the realm and throw herself on his protection, in that she was firmly resolved to hold to her husband and obey him, however badly she might be treated, so far as she could do so without committing sin. Chapuys himself was of opinion that it would be a stroke of policy for the emperor to declare war, and suggests that if, for fear of embroiling Christendom, Charles should be afraid of undertaking such an enterprise openly, the Scottish king might be aided by money from the pope and his majesty, as being a fit instrument to redress matters, in which case the Irish would afford all the assistance in their power. The moment appeared more critical to the king and his council than it really was, and the interviews between Chapuys and the Duke of Norfolk and others were very frequent. One of these was on the very day when Anne was received at the Tower of London, after landing from Queen Catharine's own barge. Two days after she went in state, on Saturday, May 31, from the Tower to Westminster, and on Whit Sunday was crowned. If we were to judge from English accounts, there was little or nothing to mar the splendour of the voyage down the river, or the return journey by land, or the coronation itself; but Chapuys describes it as having gone off very well, with the slight deduction that all looked so sad and dismal that the ceremony seemed to be a funeral rather than a pageant, 'for,' he says, 'I am told the indignation of the English against their king is daily increasing, as well as the hope that your majesty will one of these days apply a remedy to this state of things.'

On June 29, Henry made his appeal in the presence of the Archbishop of York and other witnesses against a possible excommunication, which the pope might issue on account of his divorce, and on the following July 11 Clement delivered his sentence, pronouncing upon the nullity of the divorce, and the excommunication of the king, but suspending the declaration of the same till the end of September. Between these two dates there is an important proclamation without date, but really of July 5, warning all persons not to do or say anything in prejudice of the marriage, or to recognise the queen under any other title than that of princess dowager.

It must not, however, be supposed that this was the end of the case. What was called the principal cause had not yet been begun, and on July 17 the pope wrote to the

emperor excusing himself for the long delay, and informing him that when the time comes, the principal cause shall be proceeded with without delay to its due determination. And here we light upon an important despatch of August 13 from Chapuys to the emperor. From this letter and a subsequent one often days later, we learn what is quite new, that Henry was beginning to waver, and that there was a sensible diminution of the king's passionate love for the lady, so that the imperial ambassador began to hope that he might inveigle Cromwell into a plan for bringing about a separation. Probably there had been one of those many quarrels to which other despatches allude, and Chapuys was anxious to strike whilst the iron was hot. The quarrel may have been that alluded to in a letter of September 3, in which he says the king had given Anne cause for jealousy, and had reproached her, telling her she must shut her eyes, and endure as those who were better than herself had done, and that she ought to know that he could at any time lower her as much as he had raised her. Later on, in another interview with Cromwell, he urges the point of the king's returning to his first wife, and it is evident that he was of opinion that Cromwell thought this a possible contingency, as Chapuys quoted three previous instances of kings of France having done the same. Cromwell, who probably knew little of the history of France, asked Chapuys to lend him the books in which these cases were detailed, and appears to have spoken in the most unreserved manner to him, considering that he was the ambassador from a foreign prince, who might at any moment be expected to declare war against England. Cromwell even admitted to the imperial ambassador that nothing would be easier than for the emperor to conquer the kingdom if he were to invade it, but was of opinion nevertheless that it would be of no use to him, an issue which no doubt Charles had duly contemplated, and had decided that he would not make the attempt. His ambassador, however, was quite of another mind, both as regards the desirableness of the attempt, and as regards the emperor's intentions. He is constantly urging him on to an invasion of England, thinking that such an act would be as pleasing in the eyes of God as war upon the Turks, and went the length of advising to try by all possible means to secure at his court the son of the princess's governess, meaning of course Reginald Pole, upon whom he says the succession to the crown would, in the opinion of many people here, devolve, and that on that very account the

queen herself was desirous to promote a marriage between him and the Princess Mary.

At last, on September 7, Anne Boleyn was delivered of a daughter, to the great disappointment of the king and the equally great joy of the people, who hoped that as it was a daughter, instead of the fondly hoped-for son, the Princess Mary would not be supplanted by her sister Elizabeth. What effect the birth had upon the king's mind scarcely appears. His attitude towards his new queen seems to have varied from time to time, for even as late as November 1533 we find an account of a speech made by one of Anne's maids of honour to the effect that she had often heard the king say that he would rather go begging from door to door than ever abandon her. Yet all the while it seems that Queen Catharine was positive that if the final sentence were, once given, the king would return to her. Alas! she was absolutely singular in her opinion. Whatever might become of Anne Boleyn, there was no chance of the king's returning to Catharine, and treating her as his wife, even though, as some people thought, he might be induced to submit to the inevitable, and restore her to her proper place as queen. Meanwhile, in anticipation of the final sentence, one of the last acts of the year 1533 was the appeal to a general council made by the king in August, and by Cranmer at the king's instigation, in November of this year. This was done partly perhaps to intimidate the pope, partly for the sake of saving appearances with the world at large, for not even the French king was inclined to support the anomalous condition which the See of Canterbury occupied, in rebellion against the pope, and without any support as yet from the rest of Western Christendom. There was a show of deference to ecclesiastical authority about the protest, which, if it would not impose upon the crowned heads of Europe, might play some part in reconciling the English people to the separation from the pope, of whose encroachments there had always been an extreme dislike. From this time to the end of the year 1533, we hear a good deal of general councils, and their superiority to a pope, who is only Bishop of Rome; and Cranmer was set to write a treatise on the subject, which provides that the power of councils does not extend to princes or secular matters, and that all things must be judged by Scripture. This treatise was spoken of by Burnet as a speech in the House of Lords, which he found among the Stillingfleet MSS. Mr. Gairdner has discovered it among the Hatfield MSS., and observes that it has not the

nature of a speech, but is a treatise addressed to 'My lord,' whom he reasonably supposes to be Lord Wiltshire, Anne Boleyn's father. It had been analysed by him in his sixth volume, and the correction appears in the seventh volume, which we now proceed to notice.

When the sixth of these volumes was published, we fancied that nearly all the interest in the case for the divorce was at an end. But few papers, comparatively speaking, belonging to the date of 1534, had found their way into print; and though after the sentence of July 11, 1533, there yet remained the principal cause to be determined, and all readers of history would know that the final decree that the marriage of the king with Catharine of Aragon was valid was given on March 23 in the following year, it would not have been easy to guess at the nature of the papers calendared in the seventh volume, which appeared last year. To our great surprise, it contains more intelligence that is new to English readers than any of the preceding volumes of the series. Not only have we a complete picture of what was going on at the English court in about forty letters written by Eustace Chapuys to the emperor, but there is also a full and detailed account of the proceedings at Rome in more than twenty despatches sent to Charles by Fernando de Silva, Count of Cifuentes, the imperial councillor and ambassador at Rome.

In noticing its contents, it will not be thought a purely arbitrary division if we separate the documents of the first three or four months from those of the latter part of the year. During the earlier months there were still some faint hopes entertained that the pope might be induced or constrained, either with or against his conscience, to decide the case in the king's favour. The queen, and the imperial party in general, were quite sure that this result would never be obtained, but they feared that the suit might be indefinitely protracted by the combined efforts of the French and English ambassadors, and accordingly they were urgent with the pope to bring the matter to a conclusion. The Bishop of Paris, who had left England, had arrived at Paris on January 9, and was sent soon afterwards to Rome to do what he could to delay the sentence. He arrived in the beginning of February, and Dr. Ortiz, who was acting under the orders of Cifuentes, had paid him a visit, at which the bishop informed him that when he was in England at Christmas, the queen had been so ill that her life had been despaired off. As no such intelligence had reached Rome

from the imperial ambassador in England, Cifuentes and Ortiz knew very well how to estimate the intelligence, knowing that it was part of the policy of the court to propagate such news in order, as Chapuys frequently asserts, to avert suspicion of her death, which it was thought Anne Boleyn was endeavouring to compass. Indeed, Anne's old lover Percy, now Earl of Northumberland, had declared this to a friend, who communicated it to Chapuys, that he knew for certain she meant to poison the Princess Mary; and Chapuys had thought it worth his while to inform the king that Catharine's life was in itself a safeguard against the possibility of invasion, inasmuch as she had frequently said she would rather die than be the cause of war being made on her behalf. That she herself was apprehensive of poison may be inferred from her never eating or drinking anything from the hands of the servants about her, everything being cooked for her by her own confidential servant in her room. Meanwhile, Cifuentes was having frequent interviews with the pope, but found him, though at first apparently willing to give sentence, gradually cooling down, and expecting the emperor to promise beforehand to execute the sentence when given, and hoping also that the Bishop of Paris would find some good means to get the king to obey the church out of deference to the French king. Chapuys was well aware of the object of the bishop's mission to Rome, and wrote to the Count of Cifuentes to tell the pope boldly that Henry desired nothing so much as to cause his Holiness to prevaricate in the queen's affair, and that principally with the view of detaching the emperor from the pope, in which case the King of England might be able to do as he pleased against the Church and even become reconciled to the emperor; and that a report had been spread that the emperor wished to make a new pope; saying that the French king having discovered the pope's wickedness will do wonders against him. What Francis might be inclined to do in support of his good friend and ally the King of England, was probably merely matter of conjecture in this country, but he had told Gardiner that his master might be sure of his favour and assistance if he did not hurt his honour and conscience, which he would do if he went against the authority of the Holy See, which he considered himself obliged to defend by the commandment of God and the promises he had made before their mutual alliance. He had also advised him not to trust to the German princes, who had mocked him after all the bribes he had sent them at the last election of an emperor. Never-

theless, the sanction of the Lutheran princes to the marriage with Anne Boleyn, if it could have been obtained, would have been of more value to Henry than his brother the King of France supposed; and Clement VII. was more alive to the danger in that quarter than Francis was.

The look-out was by no means a pleasant one; but the king had already secured a daughter by the new marriage who might succeed to the throne in the event of the child of whom Anne Boleyn was now supposed to be pregnant proving not to be a son; and with that strong will which was a characteristic of the Tudors, he resolved to carry things on to the bitter end. Not that he was altogether happy in his new domestic relations. The violence of his passion for Anne Boleyn seems to have been intermittent, and the imperious demeanour of the new queen might at any time overstep the bounds of prudence. The king himself still retained some affection for the Princess Mary, against whom Anne appears to have cherished inveterate hatred. Upon one occasion she actually sent Cromwell after the king to prevent him from seeing or speaking to the princess, who had been reduced to the humiliation of waiting upon Anne Boleyn's infant daughter; and though one of the principal objects of his visit was to see Mary, the king obeyed his mistress, and refused to see her, but sent Cromwell to her to urge her to renounce the title of princess. But Mary was as determined as her mother; and both would rather have died than submit to any acknowledgement of the invalidity of a marriage which had been sanctioned by the pope. Mary would show her duty to her father, but was inflexible as to the maintenance of her rights. So she sent to ask leave to kiss the king's hand, but her request was not granted. It must have been already a question at court how long Anne Boleyn would retain her ascendancy. How long another favourite had been on the *tapis* we have no means of knowing, but tidings of a new *liaison* had reached Cifuentes in the autumn of this year, for on September 20 he writes to the emperor that his present mistress was out of favour with the king, who had fallen in love with another lady, and that the people of England began to speak publicly against Anne Boleyn. Cifuentes did not give much credit to the report, but it is confirmed by a despatch of Chapuys, of the 27th, who says:—

‘ Since the king began to doubt whether his lady was *enceinte* or not, he has renewed and increased the love he formerly had for a very beautiful damsel of the court; and because the said lady wished to

drive her away, the king has been very angry, telling his said lady that she had good reason to be content with what he had done for her, which he would not do now if the thing were to begin again, and that she should consider from what she had come, and several other things, to which it is not well to attach too much importance, considering the changeable character of the said king, and the craft of the said lady, who knows well how to manage him ' (p. 463).

Mr. Gairdner does not venture any conjecture as to who the lady is, but gives his opinion that she is not Jane Seymour.

But the fatal day was drawing near, and the inevitable judgement must soon be pronounced in favour of the dispensation which had been given by Julius II. for the marriage of Henry with the virgin widow of his deceased brother Arthur. More than a year had elapsed since the death of the Cardinal of Ancona, the only cardinal who was old enough to remember the celebrated breves of dispensation, the only person who could have told the whole story from beginning to end, how the dispensation had been asked from that pope's two predecessors, how the pope himself had expressed his own ignorance as to whether such dispensation had been within his power, how, after consultation with the cardinals and examination of precedents, it had been granted with the clause *forsan cognitam*. He too could probably have explained all the difficulties connected with the second breve, which have only been entirely solved by the revelations made in this latter half of the nineteenth century by the documents at Simancas, how it was that Ferdinand and Isabella, to make assurance doubly sure, had obtained a second breve with the omission of the word *forsan*, though the very same documents prove the absence of any such necessity, and explain fully that though the Princess of Wales was still a virgin, it was thought desirable to cover any possible allegation that might at a future time be made by such an obstinate people as the English. But whether or not the old man at the age of seventy-eight would have remembered all the circumstances of the case, it was known that he had never wavered in his adherence to the side of justice; it was known also that his opinion was all-important with the pope, who would never have ventured to give sentence against it. One obstacle, indeed, had been removed by his death, which took place in 1532, but still there was no chance of the king's obtaining a decree in his favour. No amount of humble petitions to the pope to appoint Jerome Ghinucci, the Bishop of Worcester, then resident at Rome, or John da Casale, the Bishop-elect of Belluno, to the car-

dinalate, had succeeded ; and no offer of the richest bishoprics in England had prevailed upon the Cardinal of Ancona, or his nephew, the Cardinal of Ravenna, to promise their votes in favour of the king. No threatened withdrawal of England from the papal jurisdiction if he should prove obdurate, no promises to withdraw all the recently enacted statutes against the pope if he could be conciliated to allowing the validity of the marriage with Anne Boleyn, could avail to delay the sentence much longer. No efforts of the French cardinals, helped by Du Bellay, the Bishop of Paris, who was admitted to speak in the consistories held in February, would succeed in putting off the evil day. There was not one, not even Du Bellay himself, who doubted on which side justice lay ; but as to the expediency of delay, there was on political grounds a difference between the imperial party on the one side and the French and English on the other, backed as it was by the opinion of as timid a pope as ever sat in the chair of St. Peter. There was one event, and one only, which would have solved the difficulty, and that was the death of the unfortunate Queen of England, and that, it may safely be said, would have caused rejoicing in more than one or two of the courts of Europe. But Catharine still lived, though it was pretty certain that such a life of miserable anxiety could not last long. Meanwhile consistory after consistory was held all through February and March., Du Bellay, on his first arrival, had been admitted to speak on the 6th of February, and had done his best to dissuade their proceeding with the principal cause, which the auditor of the Rota, Simonetta, was getting ready for the first or second week in Lent. He had arrived on the 2nd of February, and, besides speaking in consistory, had had private interviews with Clement VII., in which he had done his best to frighten the pope by telling him how the ex-communications that had been put up in Flanders by order of Queen Mary of Hungary, the emperor's sister, who had succeeded to the regency after the death of Margaret of Savoy, had been torn down, and how the Flemings were likely to sympathise with the English in their defection from the Church. On the other hand, Cifuentes, on the part of the emperor, begged him not to believe what Du Bellay had alleged, and insisted that unless the case were speedily decided, Clement would be the cause of the queen's losing her life, as well as of the loss of the king to the Church, which might have been prevented, and possibly still might, if the pope would only be firm and just.

At last, on March 23, the sentence declaring the validity of the marriage of Henry and Catharine was pronounced in secret consistory. Many were the despatches sent on the following day from Rome to the different courts of Europe announcing the fact. One despatch was written that same night by the Bishops of Paris and Mâcon to Francis, informing him of the result of the six hours' deliberation in a consistory of twenty-two cardinals, who had been unanimous in their opinion. Ill news flies fast, and this account of the adverse determination was the first written. In it they express their regret that they cannot send better news, but say that they have done all they could to prevent one of the greatest troubles which have happened for a long time to the Church, and perhaps to all Christendom. Altogether different was the tone of the despatches which, on the next day, were sent off to the emperor. The Cardinal of Jaen, the Count of Cifuentes, and Dr. Ortiz, all wrote to the same effect, but the doctor wrote most fully and with much more enthusiasm than the emperor's agents. He also wrote to the Queen of England to congratulate her. But on this occasion there is no letter to the empress. That to the emperor, however, gives the most detailed account of the whole affair—how the admission of the excusator was again discussed, how the point whether the marriage with a deceased brother's widow was a matter of natural or Divine law, was brought up again, though last year both the Rota and the Consistory had decided that it was only unlawful by positive law. Campeggio had said that he was satisfied on this point; otherwise, if the case had rested on the virginity of Catharine at the time of her second marriage, he could not have been satisfied with the evidence which had been brought forward, though as to the fact itself he had assured the pope some years before, Catharine having mentioned it in confession to himself, and having permitted him to divulge it to the pope. But though the sentence was passed, Clement was still uneasy, and Ortiz observes that the pope fears he may have sinned in giving judgement, as the queen may be murdered in consequence of the judgement.

And now, before we go on briefly to notice the remaining part of this interesting volume, we may observe that we are reluctantly obliged to omit an immense number of documents which lie in the bypaths rather than in the high road of history. In noticing what according to our division we must call the second part of the volume, in which are calendared the State papers and letters from March 24 to the end of the

year, the chief point obviously is, the immediate effect of the sentence and the view taken of it by different parties who were more or less interested in the decision. Parliament had sat from January 15 to March 30, but even as late as this, and before the decision could have been known in England, the Acts passed against the authority of the See of Rome were in a manner conditional, the king reserving the confirmation of them to himself, or their reversal, 'in case,' as Chapuys observes, 'between this and the feast of St. John' 'it be in his power to annul it in whole or in part, which is 'a lure to induce his Holiness to consent to his desire, and 'the king has no little hope of doing so, both by means of 'the French king and of the bravadoes he employs.' The news of the decision, however, reached England on April 11, the Saturday in Easter week, and immediately the preachers for Easter were ordered to say the worst they could of the pope; and an order was given that the statutes made in Parliament should be published without delay. From this time forward there was, as it were, a declaration of war to the knife, and the queen and the princess were treated more cruelly than before. The first protest was made by Edward Carne, who with Revett was on his way to Rome. At Bologna they fell in with the Bishop of Paris on his return, and heard on April 6 that the final sentence had been pronounced. Eight days afterwards he protested, being still at Bologna, against the illegality of the proceedings, but this he must have done without instructions, unless indeed he had in secret provisionally been instructed in case the cause should be decided against the king, for Henry had determined that he would not recognise the pope before their departure, which was on March 25. Nevertheless they had been sent by the king, and the report was spread that they were going on their own private affairs and not on the king's business; for, as Chapuys observes, the king would do nothing to prejudice the archbishop's sentence, which is the helm of his navigation. Meanwhile, at home, reports were unscrupulously spread about suggesting that the pope's sentence had been given against the king, partly to revenge himself for the laws that had been passed derogating from his authority, and because Henry had made an appeal to a general council, and partly to prevent a disagreement between the princes of Christendom. It was felt that every effort must be made to secure the allegiance of the people, who were beginning to be extremely dissatisfied with Anne Boleyn, and scarcely any of whom approved of the throwing off the

allegiance to the See of Rome. The attempts to secure the Lutherans had been very unsuccessful, and so it was all-important to secure the adhesion of Francis, if only he could be induced to follow Henry's example, and set up an independent church. To this end Cromwell projected an abridgement of all the statutes touching the supremacy and the succession to the crown, to be made for the French king's information. Fears of the emperor's invading England caused orders to be issued to fortify all the places near the coast, and preachers were to be sent broadcast over the country to preach the Gospel and true Word of God, and all who upheld the authority of the Bishop of Rome were to be apprehended, for which purpose 'assured gentlemen in every shire were to be appointed and sworn of the King's Privy Council, a deputy to be sent to Ireland, and Wales to be specially watched'—so great was the apprehended danger of an insurrection. There was in reality no prospect of any invasion, though, if the emperor had intended any such measure, it must have been successful. The feelings of the people of England were known not only to the foreign ambassadors, who were on the spot and who could judge for themselves, but the restless nature of the English was fully recognised at foreign courts, and was, perhaps, somewhat over-appreciated. As regards this point, there is a most remarkable letter from a person whose name is not familiar to history, as he held no higher position than that of Spanish consul at Venice, one Martin de Cornoça. But though only a consul he actually writes to the emperor on August 4 of this year, and his letter gives a most accurate account of the facts on which he grounds his recommendation to Charles to remedy the injustice done to his aunt. His knowledge of English affairs is accounted for by a statement he himself makes in his letter, that he had spent a good part of his youth in the country. The letter is so remarkable that we must transcribe a considerable portion of it, in the words in which it has been analysed by Mr. Gairdner:—

'There is now living in these parts a great English personage named Reynaldo Polo, of the blood royal, of the illustrious house of Clarence and the Earl of Warwick. He is the son of the Countess of Salisbury, governess of the princess of Norgales, the emperor's cousin, is thirty-five years of age, very learned, prudent, and virtuous. Believes that the emperor, with such an instrument, will be able to prevail in his affairs with England without much fighting or bloodshed. The king has tried hard to gain Pole's assistance in the divorce, but he would not defile his conscience, and wrote a work to the king in the queen's

favour, showing the king the dishonourable nature of his proceedings and the danger which might follow therefrom. The king was angry at this, and Pole, with his leave, left England to study, and has been about two years and a half at the University of Padua. Pole is, by his mother's side, of the noblest blood in the kingdom. His father, Sir Richard Pole, was a worthy knight of Wales, a near relative of the late king, and greatly esteemed in his country. Reginald's elder brother is Lord Montagu, who is much beloved for his virtues. His sister is wife of the son of the Duke of Buckingham. He is related to most of the great families, and is connected by indissoluble friendship with all the queen's friends, and especially with a great lord named De Deulier. The whole of Wales is devoted to his house for his sake and the sake of his relatives Vuquingan and Vorgoña. On account of their love for the princess and the death of Don Ris, who was beheaded three years ago, the whole province is alienated from the king. The earldoms of Warwick and Salisbury are also devoted to Pole's family, and could put 20,000 men in the field. Sends a drawing of his arms. Speaks of his many virtues. If he were to go to England in its present troubled state, on account of the queen and the faith, who can doubt that, with a very little favour and help, he would be able to put the affairs of the kingdom in a good state, and that he would be received by most of the people as if he had come from heaven? Thinks that he alone could do more than 40,000 foreigners, as they would come for destruction, but he for the safety of all. It would be a pious and famous deed to help such a man in preserving a kingdom oppressed by a harlot and her friends, and in reinstating the queen and princess. The king is suspicious of Pole's family on account of their title and their wealth (although the Crown has usurped the greater part of the latter), their fidelity to the queen, and on account of Pole's absence. Does not know Pole's mind about all this, but thinks that he would not be wanting in the delivery of his country from tyranny. Recommends the emperor to make some agreement with him.

The Spanish consul at Venice was by no means singular in his advice to the emperor. The imperial ambassador in England expresses himself in precisely the same way, and enforces what he says by an appeal to his own personal observation. There were, in fact, many nobles of whom the Spanish consul could have known nothing, who would gladly have thrown in their lot with any rising in defence of the queen and the princess. Two of these, Lord Hussey, the princess's chamberlain, and the old Lord Darcy, were very outspoken to Chapuys, and seemed to have entertained more sanguine hopes from the emperor than the ambassador himself. When Chapuys endeavoured to represent to them the difficulties the emperor might experience in making war, and his reluctance to invade the kingdom for fear of oppressing an innocent people, Lord Hussey assured him that almost everybody was in expectation of a movement on the

emperor's part, and that so far from there being any possibility of the people suffering hardship, their indignation was so great that everything would be reformed before any resistance could be offered, that the nobility and clergy would at once join any such movement, and in confirmation of what he said he referred Chapuys to the old Lord Darcy, whom he called his brother. In consequence of this interview, Chapuys thought it worth while to ascertain what Lord Darcy's views really were, and he found all the information given him by Lord Hussey abundantly corroborated. There was, of course, no danger of Chapuys or his confidential servant, whom he sent to Lord Darcy to gain what information he could from him, betraying his confidence. If he had done so, Lord Darcy's head would not have remained long on his shoulders. He declared that what was going on in England was so outrageous, that he could not hold himself for a good Christian if he consented to it, and that there were 1,600 powerful nobles and gentlemen in the North who were of his opinion, though he had only declared it to a few. He would put into the field 8,000 men. Amongst others disaffected to Henry, he mentioned Lord Dacres and the Earl of Derby. He promised to do his best to stir up the people of the North against the Lutheran sect. His plan was that the emperor should have intelligence with the King of Scots, and send a small force of his own to the mouth of the Thames.

There was indeed but little chance of the emperor following the advice of the consul at Venice, though backed by all the influence that his ambassador in England could bring to bear upon the subject; but it is evident that the king and Cromwell were dreadfully afraid of an invasion, and, in their anxiety to know what the emperor intended, the letters addressed to Chapuys were intercepted on their road at Calais. Under these circumstances it was more than ever important to secure the French king's adherence, and accordingly an interview between the two kings was projected. But here another difficulty arose: ready as the people were for insurrection at a moment's notice, Henry dared not leave the country, either with or without Anne Boleyn, and accordingly the meeting of the kings was put off from August to September, and eventually was dropped altogether for this year.

Till Easter of this year the king's position was such that it might have been possible for him to recede from it; and though he was determined not to give up Anne Boleyn,

there was still the chance, to which he clung to the last, of things righting themselves, either by the papal decision being favourable, or the sentence being again deferred, or by some other possibility in the chapter of accidents. Even after the adverse sentence was passed, there were those who thought there was yet a chance of some change being brought about. Towards the autumn of the year 1534, there was a perceptible alteration in the king's conduct towards his new queen. A new favourite was known to be on the *tapis*, and something might be hoped from the death of Clement VII., which took place on September 25. Still every cardinal had voted for the queen, and Farnese, who succeeded to the papal throne, and took the name of Paul III., was not very acceptable at the court of England, though the French were exulting in his promotion. A courier had been despatched to Rome on the first news of the pope's serious illness reaching England, and Sir Gregory da Casale was sent after him, but their instructions were secret. But something may be gathered from his writing on the day before the death of the pope to say that he had arranged with regard to the election of his successor, that something might be done in accordance with the king's wishes if he could gain the assistance of the French cardinals. John da Casale also, his brother, set out for Rome from Venice by the advice of the French ambassador at Venice, thinking it well to be there on the king's part at such a crisis. It is plain that Sir Gregory was commissioned to see which way the wind was blowing, and upon finding Cardinal Farnese was pretty sure of his election, he paid his court to him, reminding him how the King of England had on a previous occasion expressed his preference for Farnese over even Campeggio and Wolsey, and obtained from the cardinal that he was anxious to satisfy the king. When the intelligence reached England on October 11, the very day on which the cardinals entered into conclave for the election of a new pope, and two days before the election actually took place, Chapuys observed that the honest men among the king's council believed that when there was a new pope the king would resume his obedience to the Church; but when the news of the pope's illness arrived, and the Duke of Norfolk and the Marquis of Exeter suggested that, like a Catholic prince, he would make no difficulty in obeying the new pope, he answered that no one should mock him by advising any such thing, for he would have no greater regard for any pope in the world that might be chosen than for the meanest priest in his kingdom. When

the news arrived the king was delighted, and Cromwell could not refrain from saying publicly several times that this great devil is dead.

In fact, Henry had now gone too far to retract, and it was of no use for the new pope to ask Sir Gregory da Casale to advise him what he should do to bring back the King of England. Cromwell was all-powerful, and had now succeeded Gardiner as secretary, and also become Master of the Rolls. He had held out a glittering bribe in the shape of the first-fruits of bishoprics, which, instead of going out of the country to Rome, now flowed into the royal exchequer. Moreover, as supreme head, and with the late submission of the clergy, Henry could at any time make what terms he pleased with archbishops and bishops and the rest of the clergy. Let the king be ever so much disgusted with Anne Boleyn, he would never now either restore Catharine to her place or allow the pope any longer to interfere with the English Church and its obsequious primate and metropolitan, as the archbishop was now called instead of legate of the apostolic see. Even the death of Catharine would now be useless. England was now effectually separated from the see of Rome, and that separation, if not final, would assuredly last the lifetime of the present sovereign. It was quite possible, indeed, that a rebellion in England might restore the old order of things, and it appeared certain that such a rebellion would be successful if only the emperor would foster and encourage it. And without doubt Charles was anxious to see his aunt and cousin, the queen and Princess Mary, restored to their rights—that is to say, if this could be done without any sacrifice of his own interests. But to Henry and his prime minister Cromwell the horizon looked very dark, and he condescended to implore the Scottish king to come to England for the purpose of joining him in his expedition to Calais, now put off till the next year, to meet the French king, offering even to pay the expenses of James, and bribing the young king, who had just attained his majority, by an offer of the Garter, ‘an order into which the emperor, the French king, and the ‘King of the Romans had already been admitted.’

We have said that the king had gone too far now to retrace his steps, and there is an important paper which, though undated, has been very properly placed by Mr. Gairdner at the head of the papers of the month of November, to which month Parliament had been prorogued, which shows how far Cromwell had it in contemplation to confiscate church property for the king's use. Amongst other pro-

visions it seems to have been intended to reduce the revenues of the archbishopric of Canterbury to 2,000 marks, and that of York to 1,000*l.*, the residue to be made sure to the king and his heirs for the defence of the realm and the maintenance of his royal estate. The bishops were to be allowed 1,000 marks as the extreme limit of their income, and for the maintenance of the estate of supreme head of the Church of England the first-fruits of every bishopric and benefice for one year after its vacation, of whosoever gift it be, was to be paid to the king. The monasteries and nunneries were to be fleeced to even a greater extent, and besides this, for the charges of the present war all spiritual persons were to be taxed 2*s.* or 4*s.* in the pound according as their income was under or over 20*l.* per annum. This important document is in the Cottonian Library. Another, which appears to go still further in suggested spoliations, is in the Record Office, but is imperfect. As the reader is probably aware, the suggestions were but imperfectly carried out in the session of Parliament which commenced on November 3.

There are other similar papers, one of which Mr. Gairdner has assigned to the month of August, which probably represents Cromwell's and Cranmer's views, but which the king certainly would not have sanctioned, as it, among other provisions, contained a prohibition of offering to images, and an allowance of the marriage and secular employment of priests. Another, which was equally beyond the king's present opinions on ecclesiastical matters, contains things necessary to be remembered before the breaking up of Parliament, viz. that there is no purgatory or sacerdotal absolution, &c., and another advocating the right of a prince to depose bishops, and of a layman to excommunicate, and another recommending the abolition of spiritual courts.

Cromwell had taken a pretty accurate measurement of his master's avaricious spirit, and the spoliation of the church's goods would largely stimulate his inclination to stand aloof from the pope for the sake of Anne Boleyn. Indeed, had the new queen been out of the question altogether, the profitable nature of the royal supremacy would have alone prevented any probability of the acknowledgement of the papal jurisdiction in England. Cromwell had boasted that Henry should be the richest king in Christendom, and the church lands were to be the instruments by which he was to become so.

ART. V.—*Life of the Honourable Mountstuart Elphinstone.* By Sir T. E. COLEBROOKE, Bart., M.P. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1884.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE'S 'Life of Mountstuart Elphinstone' is the best work of its kind that has appeared for a long time. Among the rather numerous biographies of eminent Anglo-Indians that have been published latterly, very few have been free from a tendency to diffuseness, or from an inclination to make rather too much of their central figure, by painting it on a disproportionate scale, or in a style somewhat too imposing. From these defects the book now before us is quite free; it presents us with a full-length portrait, admirably composed, of an Anglo-Indian belonging to a past generation, and to a type that has become very rare. It takes us back to one of the most stirring and important periods of our Indian history; it throws us into the middle of that tide of war and politics which at the beginning of this century was leading us on to fortune and empire; and it brings us into occasional contact with some of the leading personages of the time.

Elphinstone was a cadet, of good Scottish family, who took an appointment in the Indian Civil Service. In 1796 he reached Calcutta, whence he went up to Benares, then our frontier station to the north-west, as Peshawur is now; and there he met the Governor-General, Sir John Shore, who had come up to concert measures against a threatened Afghan invasion of India. This business, with the murder at Benares of a British Resident by a deposed Nawab of Oude, formed Elphinstone's first introduction to Indian diplomacy, and served as appropriate indications of the general political situation. Our readers will understand that at this epoch the English were only just coming into contact with the politics of Northern India, and, remotely, of the Asiatic countries lying beyond. Up to the date when Elphinstone landed in India, the centre of an important political and military operation had been, and still was, the Indian peninsula; for the battles of Plassey and Buxar had only cleared Bengal of impotent Nawabs and local competitors for the monopoly of plundering a rich but outlying province. Whereas in the peninsula not only had we been matched against formidable native Powers, such as the rulers of Mysore and the Marathas, but our real struggle was constantly with France. Mr. Seeley, in his 'Expansion of

‘ England,’ rightly lays stress on the fact, so little understood, that all our early wars in India were heartily supported at home because they formed part of our contests with the French. Every fresh declaration of war in Europe was the signal for the resumption of active operations in India; and such statesmen as Lord Cornwallis and Lord Wellesley were sent out as Governors-General, not so much to govern India as to co-operate with the European policy of England. The East India Company, which has been so incessantly accused of a greed for annexation, was actually in perpetual opposition to the ambitious and enterprising proconsuls who represented the English senate. The native Indian States, which we subdued and dismembered, were mainly grist in the great European mill, and were broken up between the upper and nether millstones of England and France. It will be found that during the two very brief intervals when a servant of the Company held the Governor-Generalship, our policy in India has been remarkably pacific; and so it happened that in Sir John Shore’s time there was a lull in war and a retrograde movement in politics. But with Lord Mornington’s appearance on the scene in 1798 the movement of the drama began again, greatly stimulated and propelled by Bonaparte’s invasion of Egypt, which was naturally regarded as a direct menace to our Asiatic possessions. Tipu of Mysore was crushed, the Nizam was compressed into alliance with us; thenceforth the Maratha States stood alone as serious rivals, and our whole policy was directed towards breaking up their confederation, and towards exterminating French influence at their Courts.

It was at this juncture, while the peace of Amiens had caused a momentary suspension of arms throughout the world, that Lord Wellesley offered Elphinstone diplomatic employment in Western India, which was then the scene of much political activity and military preparation. He accepted, of course, what was equivalent to an opportunity of going to the front, and with his friend Strachey he travelled, by a long circuitous route, through Seringapatam (where they stayed with General Arthur Wellesley) to Hyderabad, and eventually to Poona. His diary during this long journey shows the characteristics that run through all his papers and correspondence—he whiles away the time by reading Homer and Virgil, and regrets that his debts and his duty chain him to Persian and Hindi. The heat seems to have troubled the two companions very little, for they travelled, generally in palanquins, throughout the summer, and their

line took them almost entirely through the territory of native States, where they were often kept on the alert by the close vicinity of freebooting bands. They visited every remarkable place within range of an excursion, and mixed freely with the natives. The following passage gives a glimpse of what India was eighty years ago:—

‘At Malaud we found a Mahratta condottier with thirty or forty men. He had been hired by Mr. Brown for our protection. He brought a very polite letter from Mr. Brown, informing us that his province was in complete distraction, and that he had merely troops enough to enable him to keep possession of the open country. Breakfasted. Went to Strachey's tent. He had been conversing with the Mahratta, who told that Mr. Brown was at a place within two miles of Ganjam, that the refractory zemindars plundered the open country, and that from Brown's camp villages were to be seen burning on all sides. We talked over our plans for marching, and determined that we three were to ride in front with pistols. We were to be accompanied by five of Gopi Nath's (the Mahratta) men. After us were to come the baugies, the beds, and the unarmed attendants. Then were to come the elephants and camels and bullocks. The sepoys, in a body, were to bring up the rear. Our left flank was to be covered by the sea, and our right by Gopi Nath's men. Then the clashies and other armed followers.’

At the present day an officer ordered to Hyderabad or Poona is a passenger in a first-class railway carriage, and his opportunities for studying the intervening country are limited to looking through a darkened window-pane at the sliding scenes of the landscape that flash past him.

During the autumn of 1801 Elphinstone remained at Hyderabad, where he formed acquaintance with Kirkpatrick, the eccentric but very able Resident at that court, who is thus described:—

“Major Kirkpatrick is a good-looking man; seems about thirty, is really about thirty-five. He wears mustachios; his hair is cropped very short, and his fingers are dyed with henna. In other respects he is like an Englishman. He is very communicative, and very desirous to please; but he tells long stories about himself, and practises all the affectations of which the face and eyes are capable. He offered me a horse, which I declined. He said the horse should attend me, and that I might do as I pleased.” The Resident's conversation appears to have been as eccentric as his manners. He tells a strange story how his hookah-burdar, after cheating and robbing him, proceeded to England and set up as the Prince of Sylhet, took in everybody, was waited upon by Pitt, dined with the Duke of York, and was presented to the King. On the following day at dinner Major Kirkpatrick talked rather wildly about the secrets of the Government being known in the court before they were communicated officially to the Resident during the recent

negotiations for a subsidiary treaty, and he concluded with talking "with much pomp about the sources of springs, and with execrable "taste about Homer."

Early in 1802 he seems to have reached Poona at last, after roaming about, very much to his own profit, for eight months; and here began his diplomatic career, which, excepting the episode of his mission to Peshawur in 1809, was throughout intimately and exclusively connected with the decline and fall of the Maratha dominion in the Dekhan and Central India.

Like most successful men, Elphinstone was lucky in his opportunities. He reached Poona at the critical time when Lord Wellesley was preparing for the bold stroke whereby the Peshwa, whose defeat by Holkar and Sindia had driven him into our arms, was induced to accept subsidiary alliance with the English and to sign the Treaty of Bassein. We despair of interesting the general reader in the affairs of India eighty years ago; but some attempt must be made to explain the position of the pieces on the political chessboard. In South India, British supremacy was now complete. In North India, the Moghal empire had been utterly wrecked; and its richest provinces, up to Delhi, had fallen into the hands of the Nawab of Oude, the Marathas, and the English. The Marathas had become much the strongest power in all India; from Delhi, where the Moghal Emperor was in their custody, their possessions or suzerainty stretched right across India to the seashore of Guzerat on the west, and to the Dekhan hills on the south-west; their nominal head was the Peshwa at Poona, but their dominion was really shared by the Peshwa with four other powerful chiefs—Sindia, Holkar, the Raja of Berar, and the Gaicowar—all virtually independent rulers commanding large predatory armies. Lord Wellesley's first movement against the Marathas had been to detach the Peshwa from the confederation by the Treaty of Bassein; a step that alarmed and offended the others. Our relations with the Maratha leader were thus in a threatening condition when the news from Europe, that war with the French was again imminent, gave Lord Wellesley an occasion for pushing matters to an issue in India. His ground of action was, that since Perron, the French soldier of fortune, commanded the armies of Sindia and held possession of the person and nominal authority of the Moghal Emperor, therefore our rupture with France involved hostilities against Sindia. The Maratha leaders, who were themselves meditating an attack upon us, mustered their forces in a menacing

position on the Nizam's frontier; war was declared in 1803, and Elphinstone was attached to General Arthur Wellesley as political secretary. His letters from camp at the opening of the campaign mix up in an amusing jumble quotations from Homer and Catullus, from Spencer and Milton, with Anglo-Indian slang, with scraps of military and political intelligence, and with all kinds of allusions to Indian manners, places, and camp life. He was managing the intelligence department with a swollen liver and a blister on it, while Wellesley's force gradually felt its way up to close quarters with the Marathas, until the two armies met upon the battlefield of Assaye.

The description of this engagement, so celebrated as one of the severest of our Indian fights, and as the action which established Wellesley's military reputation, is given in letters from Elphinstone to his friend Strachey; and we make no apology for a rather long extract.

'The line advanced under a very hot cannonade. When we got near enough the enemy to hear them shout, the General rode back to the cavalry, whom he had sent for, and who were now in the rear. He rode full gallop, told Colonel Maxwell to take care of the right of the infantry, and rode back at speed. In coming back as in going there was the *Divil's own* cannonade (an exquisite Irish phrase which I have found out), and three horses of our party were knocked down. The General galloped forward to a line which was before us, and we were getting near it very fast when it fired a gun our way; we were barely out of musket shot. Somebody said, "Sir! that is the enemy's line." The General said, "Is it? Ha, damme, so it is!" (you know his manner) and turned. Before we got to our own line we had the satisfaction to fall in with several pieces of fine shining brass cannon which the enemy had just left. We were away about ten minutes or a quarter of an hour. Our line continued to advance; round and grape flew in all directions. About this time the 74th, who were now at the right of our line, suffered prodigiously from the cannon, and were so thinned as to encourage a body of the enemy's horse to charge them. They did so, and, I am assured by more than one eye-witness, broke and dispersed the few of them who had survived the cannonade. This was the critical moment. The 74th (I am assured and convinced) was unable to stop the enemy; and I know that the sepoys were huddled in masses, and that attempts which I saw made to form them failed; when "the genius and fortune of the Republic" brought the cavalry on to the right. They charged the enemy, drove them with great slaughter into the Joee Nulla, and so saved the 74th. After this the cavalry crossed the Joee, and the infantry, continuing to advance, drove the enemy's infantry across the Joee. They seemed to retreat in good order; but some of them must have been broke, for the cavalry, which had then crossed the nulla, charged up its bank, making a dreadful slaughter, but affording a most delightful spectacle

to us, who were halted on the side nearest to the field of battle, unable to cross on account of our guns. The General was going to attack a body of the enemy (from their left, I believe), who, when we had passed them, went and spiked our artillery and seized our guns, and recovered some of their own, and turned them all against our rear, which annoyed us a good deal. When the General was returning to the guns there was a heavy fire, and he had his horse killed under him. Soon after he came up to the cavalry, the enemy cannonading them hotly as they were formed to charge. Just as he was leaving them I heard the dragoons huzza and saw them begin to charge; rode a little way after them; but, thinking that I had stayed all day with the General, and that when I left him he was in hot water, I rode to him, but found that the enemy were moving off. We got possession of the guns and halted, and so ended the engagement. I forgot to mention the result of the cavalry charge (which must have terminated just after I quitted them; for I saw them pull up to a trot before I made up my mind to leave them). They were brought up by the fire; first halted, and then walked, and then trotted back. In this last charge Colonel Maxwell was killed. After staying some time with the 78th, I rode with the General to the Jocc, and there I lost him. I then went to the place where the 74th lost so many men, where I had not been before. The ground was covered with dead and wounded men and officers of the 74th and of the enemy. After dark I found the General in the village of Assye, close to the place where the 74th suffered so much. There the General passed the night, not in "the pride, "pomp, and circumstance of glorious war," but on the ground, close to an officer whose leg was shot off, and within five yards of a dead officer. I got some curry and bloody water, which did not show at night, and lay down and slept.

'I went yesterday evening to the field of battle. It was a dark, cloudy evening. I rode by myself, and saw *plurima mortis imago*. Some of the dead are withered, their features still remaining, but their faces blackened to the colour of coal, others still swollen and blistered. The Persian I mentioned was perfect everywhere, and had his great quilted coat on; but his face had fallen, or been eaten off, and his naked skull stared out like the hermit's of the wood of Joppa (in the "Castle of Otranto"). Kites and adjutants, larger than the Calcutta ones, were feeding on the bodies, and dogs were feasting in some places, and in others howling all over the plain. I saw a black dog tearing, in a furious way, great pieces of flesh from a dead man, looking fiercely, and not regarding me. I thought the group horrible and sublime. At last I began to feel a good deal of horror—awful, but not unpleasant—when, by way of adding to the sublimity, the evening gun fired, and to my surprise I heard a ball whistle over my head.'

However philosophic historians may vilipend the mere annalist, the world in general will continue for many a day to regard decisive battles as the most interesting and important events of past times, and will continue to read eagerly

descriptions of them when the whole historical contest is almost forgotten. Elphinstone's rough and yet vivid sketches of Indian warfare, of the English general rallying his troops, of the currents and changes of a heady fight, and of the sight of the field next day, have all the force and life of pictures. Like pictures, they satisfy our desire to understand, and if possible to realise, the scenes of bygone days, and the look and feelings of those who took part in the dramatic action of history. And we may admire the temperament that permits Elphinstone, whose imagination was deeply impressed by all that he saw, to fall back immediately on criticisms of Shakespeare and Spencer, and on his favourite classics. The following extract shows that he even revived General Wellesley's Eton reminiscences :—

‘I will tell you three things of the General to fill up. He says of . . . , “I do not blame the man ; he did what he could ; but from “habits of dissipation and idleness he has become incapable of giving “attention to an order to find out its meaning.” He said one morning that “so-and-so would have happened if we had been beat, and then I “should just have made a gallows of my ridge-pole and hanged myself.” The General, finding your “*Selecta Græca*” on my table, took them up and read the Greek part for some minutes, while I was doing something for him. He also talked of the construction of the Latin tongue. I wonder if he is a classical scholar.’

And the subjoined passage gives a description of military camp life in India ; mingling sport and marching, business and study, in his most characteristic manner ; and showing how the men lived and talked who were laying out the foundations of British dominion in India at the beginning of this century :—

‘Camp at Deotanna, November 15.

‘Here is a camp day. General at half-past four. Tent-pins rattle, and I rise and dress while they are striking my tent. Go to the front and to the Quartermaster-General's tent, and drink a cup of tea. Talk with the *état-major*, who collect there till it grows light. The assembly beats and the General comes out. We go to his breakfast table in front of his tent and breakfast ; talk all the time. It is bitter cold, and we have our greatcoats on. At half after six, or earlier, or later, mount and ride, or, when there is no hunt, we do not mind one another. The General generally rides on the dusty flank, and so nobody stays with him. Now we always join Colonel Wallace, and have such coursing a mile or so out on the flank, and when we get to our ground from ten to twelve we all sit, if our chairs have come up, or lie on the ground. The General mostly lies down. When the tent is pitched we move in, and he lies on the carpet, and we all talk, &c., till breakfast is ready. Then we breakfast off fried mutton, mutton chops, curries, &c., and from eleven to two get to our tents, and I arrange my hircarras, write

my journals, read Puffendorf, Lysias, and write you and Adam, and sometimes translate, and sometimes talk politics and other privities with the General; and then at two or three I eat a loaf and drink two glasses of port and water; and when it grows dark, unless I am writing, as I am now, I get shaved and walk about head-quarters line till it is pitch dark, and then dress, go to dinner, and we all talk about the march, &c., and they about their former wars, and about this war, and Indian courts, and politics, &c. At nine we break up, and the Quartermaster-General and Major of Brigade and I hold a committee and settle whether we march next day, and then I go to palankeen.'

From Assaye Wellesley's force marched across the Berar valley, and came up with Sindia's ally, the Berar Raja, in the middle of a wide plain, where Elphinstone witnessed a cavalry charge.

'The balls knocked up the dust under our horses' feet. I had no narrow escapes this time, and I felt quite unconcerned, never winced, nor cared how near the shot came about the worst time; and all the time I was at pains to see how the people looked, and every gentleman seemed at ease as much as if he were riding a-hunting. The opening of our guns had great effect in encouraging our people. . . . was shot in passing the village of Argaum. In the charge the dragoons used their swords for some time, and then drew their pistols. If one cut at a horseman, he would throw himself from his horse. The next man would cut him down.'

They followed up this success by laying siege to Gawilgurh, a fortress consisting of the circunvallation of a great irregular hill that stands forth out of the main range which bounds the Berar valley on the north. The operations of investing and attacking the place are given at length. Like most of the hill forts of Central India, Gawilgurh has an impregnable appearance from the side where it fronts and frowns over the plains below, but is accessible from a point at its rear, where the outstanding eminence joins the continuous range; and from this point, where our batteries had breached the wall, the fort was taken by storm. Elphinstone, after a breakfast at which they 'talked about Hafiz, 'Saadi, Horace, and Anacreon,' went down to the trenches, and asked Colonel Kenny, who was to lead the storming party, to allow him to join them.

'He bowed and agreed. Soon after Colonel Stevenson asked Colonel Kenny if he was ready. Colonel Kenny said "Yes." He was ordered to advance. We drew our swords, stuck pistols in our belts or handkerchiefs tied round our middle, and, passing in rear of the batteries, marched on to the breach. Colonel Kenny led the whole; with him went Winfield, Johnson (who had got an unfortunate Potail to go with him), and myself, and perhaps Lutwidge and an officer of the 94th.

Then followed the 94th Regiment. Our advance was silent, deliberate, and even solemn. Everybody expected the place to be well defended. As we got near we saw a number of people running on the rampart, near the breach. Colonel Kenny said they were manning the works. I asked him if they were not flying. He said, "No! no! they won't fly yet awhile." We went and got close to the works, to a wide hedge, where Johnson had been during the night. I was amazed that they did not fire; our cannon fired over our heads. We got to the breach, where we halted, and let the forlorn hope, a sergeant's party, run up; then we followed, ran along, and dashed up the second breach and huzzaed. Perhaps the enemy fired a little from some huts by the second breach. I did not see them do so. I saw some of them bayoneted there. We kept to the right after entering the second breach, and soon after the troops poured in, so that there was no distinguishing forlorn hope or anything. Colonel Kenny knocked up, and Johnson and I lost him. I had been frequently told, particularly in the trenches just before advancing, that I should be taken for a European of the enemy's, from my not having regimentals. I thought little of this after leaving the trenches; but in this confusion, losing Johnson, I told Winfield what I apprehended, and stuck to him. I after did the same to Lutwidge. Going on to the right, we came to a valley leading to the Cool Derwazeh (back gate, postern), down which the enemy were crowding in their flight. . . .

'When we went on to the breach I thought I was going to a great danger; but my mind was so made up to it, that I did not care for anything. The party going to the storm put me in mind of the eighth and ninth verses of the third book of Homer:—

*οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἴσαν σιγῇ μένεα πνείοντες Ἀχαιοί,
ἐν θυμῷ μεμῶτες ἀλεξέμεν ἀλλήλοισιν.'*

By these operations the Bhunla Raja was almost entirely ejected from Berar; but he retired to his capital at Nagpore, where Elphinstone was appointed, as British Resident, to look after him. In those days an officer at a native court was cut off from English society. Elphinstone expresses, in a letter to Strachey, his dread of the solitary life, and of a society 'where people speak what they don't think in 'Moorish' (Hindusthani). However, he stayed at Nagpore some years, and very soon became absorbed in the diplomatic complications of that shifty and unsettled period, when we were still fighting Holkar, and when the great Maratha chiefs, whom our campaigns had maimed, but had not finally crippled, were watching their opportunity to strike again. All Central India was still in confusion; the Pindaree plundering bands were abroad in every direction; the Maratha troops were as bad as the Pindarees; Sindia had imprisoned the British Resident at his court; and the evident anxiety of

the British Government for peace, after Lord Wellesley's recall, had given fresh encouragement to the sullen hostilities of the Marathas. The following remarks of Elphinstone upon the attempts of the English to conciliate the Maratha powers whom they had stripped of half their acquisitions, apply invariably, now as then, to any such overtures :—

‘I cannot partake your joy at Lord Cornwallis's being sent out. I do not think Lord Wellesley deserves to be superseded, and I tremble at the thoughts of change of measures which must bring all the Mahrattas on us. Lord Wellesley's evident desire for peace has already had the most pernicious effects. If you want to conciliate the people, give them back their country. No other plan will succeed. If you keep it, you must fight for it. It appears to me that most mistakes in politics arise from an ignorance of the plain maxim and its corollaries, viz. it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be. Hang the subject! it makes me sick.’

All experience shows that only long lapse of time will heal the wounds caused to a state or a people by territorial amputation; they may appear to close up, but an accident will reopen them, and they keep the whole body politic in a feverish condition. Nor indeed did the discontented intrigues and threatening symptoms disappear until the war of 1817 finally settled down the warlike Maratha principalities of Holkar and Sindia within the territorial limits which, with a few changes, they retain at this day.

Elphinstone's journal during the years 1803-7, that he spent at Nagpore, are full of notes of classic reading, of sport, and of local politics, now uninteresting to all but a stray Anglo-Indian, who may appreciate the local colouring. He took to sport, as many another in similar cases has done, to pass away the time and to combat depression; he fancied himself lost in the wilderness and cut off from the main line of enterprise and promotion; he fell into dreamy literary moods, and when some raid of Pindarees close at hand wakened him up, he was divided between pleasure at finding himself again *in trepidis rebus* and fear of losing his beloved books. All this will be read with sympathy by those who have known life far off amid the melancholy Indian plains, and who may perchance recollect how even the Mutiny was welcomed as a distinct break in the monotony of ordinary existence. In his journal of this time memoranda on the Mutiny at Vellore and a military conspiracy at Hyderabad are jumbled up with notes on the disaster of Nicias before Syracuse and on the perfidious seizing of

Thebes, in a way that might disconcert unlearned readers. In Europe war came slowly, but when it came was occasionally momentous.

'February 26.—Read Philoctetes till daybreak. Shot on the Telegau tank, and shot a brace of hares. At dinner received Europe news. The Austrian army at Ulm destroyed. The French and Spanish fleets annihilated, and Nelson no more. I am stupefied with the news; but feel more horror at the prospect of Continental affairs than joy at our naval success.

'March 7.—Had a slight at a heron and a ride, but no hunting. I did not go to tiffin, but took a biscuit in my own room. This will save two or two hours and a half. Read Philoctetes.'

This side of Elphinstone's character, indeed, illustrates a species of Anglo-Indian that was always most uncommon, and of which no remarkable specimen has for many years been seen among the leading men of later times in India. The distinguished Anglo-Indian of the later period has seldom been a man of refined literary taste; the modern school has rather been represented by high-minded, hard-headed, vigorous men, whose occasional reflections, as betrayed by their biographers, or literature, poetry, or philosophy, are of a kind that would have thrown Elphinstone into one of his deepest fits of depression. But Elphinstone was one of those to whom the scenes and incidents of uncivilised India have a curious power of reviving, by a sort of far-off resemblance, the ideas and the events of classic antiquity. The fresh primitive movement of the early world, the strength and simplicity of the feelings, even the heroic style of the ancients, are much more in harmony with uncivilised than with civilised life; the circumstances are much more in keeping with Asiatic than with modern European environment. To an Indian officer who has served in Afghan campaigns Xenophon's account of the masterly retreat of the 10,000 Greeks may have an interest that no ordinary student could possibly comprehend; while it is a matter of observation that in arduous movements the school-boy quotations from Homer and Horace come naturally to men's lips. The truth is that the old writers put tragical and passionate situations directly and vividly, drawing from the life; and there is a great charm in discovering how exactly words said or sung two thousand years ago may still fit into a man's thoughts and stir his temper at some critical conjuncture.

To return from this digression. In 1807 Elphinstone

went to Calcutta, travelling in straight line eastward through a very wild country. He saw Lord Minto at a levée, and describes the interview:—

‘He is a man of as courtly manners as Lord Wellesley; but though he is less lively, he is far more finished and elegant. He seems quite simple and natural. He has a good person, and stands the fatigue of a levée without being either exhausted or nervous. He does not appear to think of himself at all. He never appears to act condescension, but seems to be naturally mild, obliging, and unassuming. I think he will be popular, but I also believe, from his speech to Barlow, his canopy, his guards, that, *au fond*, he loves pomp, both in diction and retinue (pardon the conceit), as well as *Villainy* [Wellesley] did. He has been very civil to Adam and my brother, but very unlucky in his attentions to me. He began his acquaintance with me at the levée, and to prevent my being intoxicated with his smile he “changed his hand and checked “my pride” by asking me if I was a relation of the chairman. He next spoke in the most desponding way of the fate of the “Blenheim” (on board which he said he knew I had a cousin), and sent me home overwhelmed with anxiety and low spirits. Other people give me better accounts of the “Blenheim,” so I have time to think on the chairman.’

After staying nine months in Calcutta he returned *via* Hyderabad to Nagpore by April 1808, having accomplished another of those roundabout rambling journeys to which he probably owed much of his knowledge of India and his insight into the ways of the people. He seems to have acquired that proper disregard of time which is the essential note of genuine Oriental travel; a note that is becoming utterly lost among Asiatic excursionists of the present day; he diverged constantly to see interesting people or places; he halted as long as he liked; while his final entry into Nagpore will have the interest of contrast to those who now pass over the same country by the railway.

‘We marched into Omrauty, and on the same day the Pindarrees, to the number of 4,000 or 5,000, swept a great part of the road I had just travelled, and took a tent and some camels of mine that were coming on in the rear. Had we been a day later we must have been taken. . . .

‘Futteh Jung accompanied us to the frontier, three marches, with one thousand horse, a battalion and four guns. I forgot to say that we generally hunted and hawked from daybreak to ten or twelve. We came on in this direction very quietly, till we got to the ground from which we were to march into Nagpore. We there heard that the Pindarrees were abroad, and not far from us; so, instead of pitching our tents, we marched on to Nagpore, being thirty odd miles in all. We marched in excellent order, and would certainly have beat off the

Pindarrees if they had come. That is by no means the case here. If they came to Nagpoor we should easily defend our plate, &c.; but our bungalows and my books would probably be at the mercy of the Pindarrees, and our servants and followers would have to shift for themselves. Their coming is now very probable; for, in the incursion in which my tents were taken, they burnt some houses within a mile and a half of the Residency, and their parties came to where that cart of wood is passing, beyond the old woman with the red petticoat. If you were here, you would see the very spot. The effect of this and the like is to make the gentlemen here quite indifferent about the Pindarrees, though alert enough in case of their coming. The worst of it is that, though we live in constant alarm, they are only alarms. If we had now and then little skirmishes and night attacks, we should improve wonderfully, and in time be perfect Deloraines.'

He left Nagpore again almost immediately, on a long march northward to join Sindia's camp, which he reached near Nágur, now a flourishing town, but the first plundered by Sindia's troops, and so desolate that Elphinstone saw partridges in one of the principal streets. His description of Sindia's camp will help us of the present day to understand the confusion into which the country had fallen, and the loose, disorderly nature of the powers that exercised dominion, without the slightest attempt to exercise the functions of government, over the richest parts of India.

'It is difficult to give you an idea of this place. Conceive a king and his court with all their servants and retinue, a very small army of regular infantry and irregular cavalry, and a collection of shopkeepers and every other description of people that is found in a town, the whole amounting to 150,000 men, crowded into a camp in which all pitch in confusion, in all kinds and sizes of tents; add one great street with shops of all kinds in tents on each side of it, and, in the middle of the whole, one great enclosure of canvas walls, containing a great number of tents for the accommodation of Sindia and his family; and this will give you as clear a notion of a Mahratta camp as it is possible to have of so confused a thing. Now figure the same people with their tents and baggage loaded on elephants, camels, bullocks, and ponies, all mixed up together, and straggling over the country, for fifteen miles in length and two or three in breadth, and you have a notion of the same army marching. The confusion of the Government is greater than that of the camp or line of march. When I arrived, Sindia and all his Ministers were confined by a body of troops, who had mutinied for pay. The Ministers were kept without eating, but the prince, who was allowed to do as he pleased, was very little affected by the state of affairs, and spent his days very comfortably in playing cards with his favourites. This prevented my seeing Sindia for a week, after which he received me with great splendour, and from the show and regularity of his Court one would have thought that there had never been such a thing as a mutiny heard of. But within a fortnight another much

more serious mutiny broke out, and there was very near being a battle. In this way Sindia wanders over all the centre of Hindustan, levying his own revenue, and plundering his weaker neighbours, with no variety, except that he sometimes halts during the rainy season, sometimes has a fort to besiege, and sometimes a battle to fight.'

He was thus marching about with Sindia, whose troops were incessantly mutinying, quarrelling, sacking the villages, and wrangling over pay or booty, when he received orders from the Governor-General to proceed immediately to Delhi, on his way to Kabul. He marched forty miles a day into Agra, thence to Delhi, where he met Metcalfe (afterwards Lord Metcalfe), 'a mild, good-natured, clever, enterprising fellow,' and he started for the Afghan frontier in October 1808.

The objects and reasons of Elphinstone's mission to the Afghan ruler, and the political situation at the time when it was despatched, are very clearly explained by Sir Edward Colebrooke. Our apprehensions of French interference in India had been greatly increased by Bonaparte's successes in Europe; and our alarm culminated when he made peace with Russia at Tilsit. It is remarkable that, although England has shown herself almost negligent of risks from attacks by enemies close at hand just beyond narrow seas, yet the most distant movement that seemed to threaten India has always roused her susceptibilities; possibly because the English, long accustomed to the safety of an island, are more nervous than a continental nation would be at the apparent insecurity of a land frontier. However this may be, it is certain that although India is guarded on its north-western border by mountains, deserts, savage tribes, and almost every barrier that nature could supply, nevertheless any project of invasion from across Asia has always aroused our diplomatic energies. And so when Napoleon caused plans of an expedition to be prepared, and sent a brilliant embassy to Persia, the Governor-General of India at once despatched missions to Sind, Lahore, Kabul, and Tehran. It is easy for us now to say, and to show, that the project of sending a French expedition from the coast of Syria or from the Persian Gulf, against India, was manifestly chimerical; the French had been for many years and still were to the Anglo-Indian politician what the Russians have been to him, with greater reason, for the last five-and-forty years. Lord Minto was thoroughly alarmed; and Mr. Elphinstone was invested with authority to propose a formal alliance with the Kabul ruler, while he was to beat very cautiously about

the question of sending a military force, if necessary, to support the Afghans. But before Elphinstone could reach the frontier, the Spanish insurrection, and the renewal of war with Austria, had provided ample work for the French army in Europe; the Afghan mission lost its motive; and the history of the whole transaction is now interesting only because it shows the premature and embryonic stage of those political and military problems in regard to India's defence on the north-west, that have been ever since steadily growing in form and substance, until even the most shortsighted must now discern the shadow cast on that horizon by coming events. In presence of an advance by some European Power from a western base to the confines of Afghanistan, what measures, diplomatic and strategic, are to be taken in regard to Afghanistan? This is the question that at the present moment is being actively discussed, and that Elphinstone discussed with Lord Minto in 1809. In one letter he lays stress on the impolicy of sending an army to Kabul, and he points out, what is always to be kept in mind, that our future troubles lie not so much in the prospect of a direct attack from beyond Afghanistan by an army attempting to march through that country, as in the gradual occupation of Afghanistan by some Power that may make it a base for eventual hostilities at a convenient time.

“To Lord Minto he wrote from Mooltan, pointing out the impolicy of sending an army to Cabul, “because it would be to meet the French
“on equal terms, and to waive the advantages of the strong position to
“the westward presented by the rivers of the Punjab, the Indus, and
“the desert. In the present state of the intermediate country, I fear it
“will be found impossible to defend Cabul; it is, however, very much
“to be wished that it were practicable for us to contribute more
“directly to prevent that country falling into the hands of the French;
“for if they were once in possession of it, their invasion of our
“territories would be no longer a great and desperate enterprise, but an
“attempt they might make without risk, when they pleased, and
“repeat whenever the state of our affairs gave a prospect of success.
“It is also very desirable that we should be able to hold out some
“advantage to the King of Cabul more attractive than that of mere
“safety from the French.”

Elphinstone's mission was from the first a failure; for he was empowered to offer nothing more than a vague alliance; and the Afghans naturally stood out for something substantial. But it soon became evident that Shah Soojah, with whom we were treating, was himself in a desperate plight; and before the mission had crossed the Indus on its return

journey, he was defeated and driven out of his kingdom. The only profit of the mission was a large addition to our knowledge of Afghanistan—for Elphinstone's 'Account of the 'Kingdom of Kabul' is, remembering that he never went beyond Peshawur, wonderfully accurate and comprehensive—and some clearing up of our political ideas regarding the character of the people, and our proper relations towards them. Elphinstone's 'Memoranda on an Invasion of India 'from the North-West,' written when British outposts were hundreds of miles east of the Indus, is full of solid reasoning. He argues that the right system of defence, so long as it is possible, lies in maintaining such a political influence over the Afghans as shall enable us to raise the tribes on any foreigner who shall endeavour to enter or to occupy their country; their rising being supported, if need be, by our troops. If the Afghans are for us, this is our first and a formidable line of defence; if they turn against us, we can only propose a strategic plan of defending India that would require a very large army. But he remarks pithily, and the remark has even more pith in it now than in his time, 'I 'have heard of no plan that would not require a large army, 'and indeed without one we should have no chance at all, 'except that of the French not coming.' While our generals are digesting this axiom, our statesmen may consider the following criticism of a policy that halts between Persia and Afghanistan, and loses firm hold of either power by half-hearted and alternating efforts to conciliate both.

'For our foreign policy, I think we ought to choose between Persia and Cabul, it being impossible to keep equally with both. If [we cannot bring the King to defend his country] we might as well not risk our money, our reputation, and our other alliances by attempting it, but consider Persia as a secondary object, and take decidedly to Cabul. We might then give the King money enough to make him an efficient ally, without spending more than we now give the King of Persia for his temporary goodwill, and we could turn the whole of our attention and resources to the defence of the noble frontier formed by the desert, the mountains, and the Indus.'

To the modern Anglo-Indian official the leisurely, circuitous, wandering fashion in which Elphinstone moved from one appointment to another, must appear as remarkable as enviable. In these days, an officer ordered from Peshawur to Poona would probably be expected to join his new post in a week or ten days, and the greater the heat the faster he would run through it. Elphinstone left Peshawur in June, 1809; in the autumn he is found at Delhi, where he seems

to have remained until the summer of 1810. Thence he went to Calcutta, and, having been appointed Resident at Poona, started to sail round India to the west coast in January, 1811; so that he must have reached his destination about the middle of that year, or two years after his mission ended at Peshawur. In passing through Bombay he met Sir James Mackintosh, who persuaded him to publish his 'Account of 'Kabul,' and whose memoirs contain a note of Elphinstone having breakfasted with him.

'Malcolm brought Elphinstone to breakfast. We had an animated discussion about the importance of India to England. I contended that it was not of any great value. I observed that, of possessions beyond the sea, the first rank belonged to those which, like North America, contributed both to strength and wealth: the second is to those which, like the West Indies, contributed to wealth and created maritime strength, though they did not supply a military population. India certainly ranks below them; nobody thinks of employing sepoys out of India. Great as it looks and sounds, it does not add so much to the empire as New England did.'

Elphinstone now set to work on his Kabul book; but he laments the disqualification for authorship imposed on him, as he supposes, by his life of travel, his desultory reading, and his isolation from literary society; contrasting these drawbacks with Gibbon's sedentary and studious way of existence among learned men and libraries. It does not seem to occur to him that Gibbon wrote of the past, and dealt with historic records and researches into antiquity; while Elphinstone's business was with the Afghanistan of his own day, and with the characteristics, political, ethnic, and social, of a country almost devoid of annals and without literature. As a matter of fact, his position at an Asiatic court, in the midst of the disputes and intrigues of the Dekhan, his large acquaintance with various Asiatic races, and his opportunities of talking with them, were all conditions most favourable to writing his book. His work was much interrupted by public business, but he finished it in 1814; and very soon afterwards arose those complications in our relations with the Peshwa that led rapidly to the dissolution of the Maratha power in the Dekhan.

To those who are acquainted with the course of Indian affairs during the present century, the history of these transactions is familiar; to those who have no such acquaintance it would be difficult to make a short summary of them interesting. It is sufficient here to observe that the decline and fall of the Peshwa followed an order of events and con-

sequences well known to students of Oriental politics. As soon as an Asiatic monarch feels himself moderately steady and strong on his throne, out of danger from rivals and foreign invaders, he employs his forces to break down any independent authority within his borders, and to reduce all his subjects as nearly as possible to the same dead level beneath him. If he succeeds, he becomes all-powerful for the time; if he fails, he usually makes way for some one else. Now an Indian prince, under British protection, is artificially secure from external enemies and internal competitors; so that he is able to give undivided attention to the business of demolishing any petty chiefs within his dominion, and of thus indemnifying himself for loss of complete independence abroad by making himself thoroughly master at home. The Peshwa was politically in a state of transition. He had found leisure, under British protection, to enter upon a systematic course of confiscating the lands of his jagirdars and feudatories; while he had not yet submitted altogether to British control in the matter of his relations with other Indian states. He began to press demands upon some of his neighbours, and to assert sovereignty over others; the representatives of all the principal rulers in India still resided at his court; in short, he maintained an attitude and claimed prerogatives that were inevitably regarded by the British Government as ambiguous. The necessary consequence was, that the British Resident found himself incessantly interfering with the Peshwa's plans and proceedings; that much friction and irritation ensued, and that the uncertainty of the situation kept the whole country unsettled. It is to be recollected that there was, at that time, nothing absolutely chimerical in the idea that a fresh league of native powers might hazard one more trial of issues with the English for dominion in India. We quote from a despatch by Elphinstone on the character of the Peshwa's government (1815):—

‘The state of our relations to the Peshwa has always been much influenced by his Highness's personal character, and it might be interesting to speculate on the form they might assume if the numerous claims and pretensions of this Government were to fall into the hands of an active and warlike Peshwa, who would attend to the improvement of his army, conciliate his jageerdars, and encourage the former great feudatories of the empire to look on him as their chief. It is obvious that in the present state of India there are fine materials for a powerful confederacy under such a leader; but he must be an extraordinary genius who could start up with such a character from the midst of a long peace and of a Brahmin education.’

The Peshwa was not of the calibre of princes who skilfully

and patiently organise formidable coalitions. He was weak, dissolute, and revengeful; he took offence at the conduct of the Gaicowar's envoy to Poona, and had him assassinated through the agency of his prime minister, Trimbukjee, in the open street. He was compelled by the British Government to imprison Trimbukjee, and connived at his escape; he assembled his troops, tried to stir up the other Maratha princes, and under the impulse of the mixed terror and rash pugnacity that so often seizes Asiatics, he was evidently preparing for some desperate act. At this time Lord Hastings suddenly drove the Peshwa into a corner by instructing Elphinstone to propose to him a treaty acknowledging his complete dependence on the British power, and surrendering all claim to the titular leadership of the Maratha empire. The Peshwa was taken aback and submitted, but the effect of humiliating him was naturally to increase his hostility; and the treaty only cleared the ground that was soon to be the field of the last ineffectual struggle by a native ruler against British supremacy in India.

For the moment, however, the political fever-fit subsided, and Elphinstone had more leisure for sport and literature. In a letter to Strachey (February, 1816), he describes his manner of life at Poona, and gives a rapid sketch of the general state and tendency of Indian affairs.

‘I used to be constantly employed in resisting the encroachments and intrigues of the former Minister; and now I have time to read Cicero till twelve every day, and Herodotus with Jefferys (the doctor) from six o'clock till dinner-time. I hope my godson will know more Greek at ten than I do after twenty years' reading it, off and on. We have a hog hunt that goes out every second Wednesday, in the evening, to some place from ten to twenty miles off, hunts on Thursday, returning on Friday to breakfast. I shall now give you what news there is; if I have room and time I will tell you about Ellora, &c. The Pindarrees are becoming very bold. One party last year passed near Seroor, threatened Punderpoor, swept round to the south of Hyderabad, approached the Kistna, struck the ceded districts into consternation, alarmed the people at Madras, returned towards the north along the frontier, and recrossed the Nerbudda loaded with plunder. The accounts of their camp after this expedition put one in mind of the first Mohammedan conquerors in India, or the Spaniards in America. One of the news-writers, when he entered the camp, found a party dividing their booty of gold, jewels, and rich stuffs, and weighing a golden idol they had taken from some temple. We must be at them soon, but in the meantime it is thought we shall have another campaign against Nepal, the Goorkas having refused to ratify the treaty. Cutch has been subdued with little difficulty, as our force was strong—6,000 or 7,000 Native and European. The Sikhs, not deterred by their

disastrous attempt last year, are going to make another attack on Cashmere. The Vizier of Caubul has marched to Attock to attack them; but it is curious to see what remote causes affect politics. The French war having induced the Russians to make a truce with Persia, that Power is disengaged, and has now sent a force towards Herat; while, on the other hand, the Emperor of China, having threatened the frontier of Cokaun or Ferghana, has led the Khan of that country to make peace with the King of Bokhara, which monarch has resolved to fill up his leisure time by supporting old Shah Zemaun in an attempt to recover the crown of Caubul. The real motive probably is a wish to get Balkh, as all the inhabitants are Uzbegs, and their present subjection to Caubul is but loose. This will call back the Vizier, and leave the Sikhs unmolested.'

The following remarks (from a letter to Lord Keith) upon the possibilities of a successful invasion of India will enable our readers to compare the political situation of our dominions as they were then with the situation at the present day. The risk and difficulty of stopping short were already realised; and Elphinstone points with true instinct to the powerful motives and exigencies that pressed forward the expansion of our territories until, fifty years later, his desideratum of a solid and compact empire had been fulfilled.

'Sir Pulteney gives very interesting notes of his conversations with Bonaparte, which of course you have heard. Nobody seems to have asked him, what is so important to people connected with India, whether he had any real design of sending a force against this country. If he had attempted it, and had been well supported by the Russians, he would very likely have beat us. Even now, if the Russians were to conquer Persia, as report says is their design, we should be in a great measure at their mercy. Not but what we could defend the admirable frontier which India possesses, if we were secure in the interior; but at present the centre of India would require to be watched as much as the frontier. We have long since (perhaps in Lord Clive's time) abandoned the policy by which we might perhaps have avoided existing jealousy, and we have stopped short in the midst of the only other line that was either safe or consistent, that of establishing our ascendancy over the whole of India. In consequence, we have all the odium without the energy of the conquering people, and all the responsibility of an extensive empire, without its resources or its military advantages. There would be some reason for remaining in this dangerous position if we were increasing our strength, in the meantime, by the advantages of peace; but so far are we from that, that our provinces and the dominions of our allies are much more exposed to invasion and plunder than they would be in time of war, and the money expended in any one year on our present defensive system (which is quite inefficient) would probably have been sufficient to crush all our enemies, and to give us a solid and compact empire to defend.'

In the meantime, between the Peshwa and the Pindarees,

there was little likelihood that the wheel of our Indian fortune would long stand still. Elphinstone was, nevertheless, thinking of home; but, like most Anglo-Indians, he feared that he was too old for a fresh start in English society. He was shy, he said, of the 'long-robed Trojan women,' doubting whether he should feel at ease amid the rustle of English petticoats, which at that epoch were, by the way, very short. He styles Childe Harold 'exquisite blue-devilage;' he is seized with a Byronic passion for travelling in Greece; and is not much attracted by the prospect of being appointed Governor of Bombay. 'A Governor of Bombay must always be hated. His great duty is to economise and to buy 'cotton.' Then follow the intervals of spleen and depression that are part of an Indian life; not fits of day-dreaming wherein, as he says truly, 'one is apt to confound the ideal 'with the real, and to act on, or at least to talk on, totally 'false grounds.' Of retired Anglo-Indian officers he observes, that the best of them 'look back, in the idleness and obscurity of home, with fondness to the country where they have 'been useful and distinguished, like the ghosts of Homer's 'heroes, who prefer the exertions of a labourer on the earth 'to all the listless enjoyments of Elysium.' These maladies he resolves to cure by philosophy, by reading Greek, and by active occupations, of which last-mentioned prescription he was lucky enough to receive without delay an ample and opportune dose.

In 1817 our military force at Poona had been much weakened by the despatch of troops to join in the operations against the Pindarees. The Peshwa had persuaded Sir John Malcolm to believe in his protestations, that he would act as a faithful British ally; our detachments marched northward, and when the Peshwa was questioned in regard to his continued warlike preparations, his answer was, that Malcolm had invited him to co-operate with the British against the Pindarees. It soon became clear that he inclined to co-operate with the Pindarees against the British; but he procrastinated in the hope of corrupting our sepoys, until some of our reinforcements had come up, when the British force took position at Kirkee, about four miles from Poona; and on October 31 the Maratha army poured out of that city to attack us. No passage in Indian history has been more often quoted than the description, in Grant Duff's 'History 'of the Marathas,' of the great flood of cavalry issuing through the city gates, and spreading over the country like a tremendous inundation, 'towards the afternoon of a very sultry

‘day; there was a dead calm, and no sound was heard, except the rushing, the trampling, and neighing of horses, and the rumbling of the gun-wheels. The effect was heightened by seeing the peaceful peasantry flying from their work,’ &c. It is one of those rare battle-pieces, drawn from sight and with the deep impressions of reality, that have come down to us from the old Indian war-times before the era of graphic correspondents; like Elphinstone’s sketch of Assaye, or like that vivid picture, by a native eyewitness, of Ahmed Shah Durain, on horseback before dawn on the morning of the great battle of Paniput, when the cannon from the Maratha camp warned him that the whole Maratha army was marching out upon his lines. But at Kirkee the Marathas did little beyond exhibiting to the British Resident a magnificent scenic display. At Elphinstone’s order the small British force, adopting the only tactics that are never wrong in front of an Asiatic enemy, made a movement forward, when ‘the enemy’s whole mass of cavalry’ (writes Elphinstone) ‘came on at speed in the most splendid style. The rush of horse, the sound of the earth, the waving of flags, the brandishing of spears, were grand beyond description, but perfectly ineffectual;’ and after one rather serious charge on the English flank, the Marathas abandoned the field. The honour of the day was, by general consent of his contemporaries, awarded to Elphinstone, whose reputation was thenceforward established, and who may be said to have taken from that day the highest place among the Anglo-Indian statesmen and diplomatists of his time.

After this action the Peshwa evacuated Poona, and then followed the events and operations of the general war. The Maratha chief of Nagpore, who was in collusion with the Peshwa, attacked the British Residency; but his forces were worsted after a sharp and hazardous conflict. Sindia was held in check; the Pindarees were dispersed or subdued, and Elphinstone pursued the flying Peshwa up and down the Dekhan until he finally succumbed. The results of this campaign were the pacification of all Central India, the final disruption of the Maratha League, and the consolidation of British supremacy from the sea to the Sutlej.

Early in 1818 was issued a proclamation annexing the Peshwa’s territories to the British dominions, and for some months afterwards Elphinstone was constantly engaged in accompanying the flying columns that were dispersing detached bodies of Maratha troops and reducing the different strongholds. His diary at this period is full of reference to

the diverse scenes and incidents, military and diplomatic, of his marching and counter-marching. No Englishman has shown a better eye for the picturesque, or even romantic, side of Indian camp-life in stirring and disorderly times—the calm beauty of the landscape at early morning, the bold outline of a hill just overhanging some precipitous cliff, the contrast of the still scenery before action begins with the smoke-wreaths and the thundering echo along the hills of the opening batteries—the vivid feeling aroused by the sight of real fighting, whether it be a cannonade in the mountains or a skirmish over the stony plain—all these impressions evidently touched Elphinstone with a pleasurable animation that carried him through his labours and difficulties. The strongholds were rapidly reduced; the newly acquired provinces passed quietly under British rule; the people at large acquiesced with the usual Indian indifference to mere governments; and Elphinstone set himself to manage the administrative transition from native to English systems and institutions.

His letters and memoranda during this period contain much that is still instructive to Indian politicians. ‘There is something alarming,’ he writes, ‘in the great strides we are making towards universal dominion.’ He perceived the adventurous, and occasionally precarious, nature of a course that was leading us out into the open sea of Asiatic empire, with all its untried dangers and unbounded liabilities; he had seen, as he said, the native States in the days of their power, and he was still disposed to deal warily and generously with them; and he saw, like all far-seeing Indian statesmen, that so soon as our supremacy in India should be indisputably affirmed, our advantage thenceforward lay in upholding instead of lowering all the lesser principalities that acknowledged our sovereignty. He pointed, with sure judgement and precision, to the two sources whence real peril might arise to threaten the British Empire, as soon as it should have reached its climacteric. ‘If,’ he wrote, ‘we can manage our native army and keep out the Russians, I see nothing to threaten the safety of our empire until the natives become enlightened under our tuition and a separation becomes desirable to both parties.’ And again, in speculating on the probable duration of our power in India, he writes to Sir James Mackintosh:—

‘I am afraid the belief that our Indian Empire will not be long-lived is reason, and not prejudice. It is difficult to guess the death it may die; but if it escapes the Russians, and other foreign attacks, I think

the seeds of its ruin will be found in the native army—a delicate and dangerous machine, which a little mismanagement may easily turn against us. The most desirable death for us to die of should be, the improvement of the natives reaching such a pitch as would render it impossible for a foreign nation to retain the government; but this seems at an immeasurable distance. Colonisation would help it on, but colonisation must begin by crowding and disgusting the natives. Europeans would penetrate into all parts of the country, offending their prejudices, encroaching on their rights, and occupying many of the employments from which they derive their subsistence. This, and the fear of a colonial public, with all the narrowness and selfishness of a population of whites, appear to be the only objections to colonisation. As to its having a remote tendency to occasion a separation, I think that no sort of disadvantage. A time of separation must come; and it is for our interest to have an early separation from a civilised people rather than a violent rupture with a barbarous nation, in which it is probable that all our settlers, and even our commerce, would perish, along with all the institutions we had introduced into the country.’

The Mutiny of 1857 proved the accuracy of Elphinstone’s prognostications in regard to our native army; but it was easier then to perceive that some such outbreak must be the inevitable (probably it is the invariable) sequel to a career of Asiatic conquest with mercenary troops, than it is even now to forecast the effect of Russia’s gradual approach to our north-west frontier. The English in India now wield the entire force of a mighty and well-organised dominion, and, although they are pleased to indulge in chronic alarms at each forward step of Russia across the central deserts of Asia, yet if ever rumours deepen into actual menaces of invasion the English nation will take a very different tone. The spectacle of two great European nations contending on some battle-ground between the Oxus and the Indus for supremacy in Asia would be a strange revival of the old-world struggles for empire. No pains should be spared to avert such a collision, for it might upset half the world; and we have to remember always that upon the maintenance of peace and a good understanding between England and Russia, upon the discovery of a *modus vivendi* between the two civilising powers, depends the immediate future of the whole Asiatic continent.

Elphinstone devoted the last two months of his stay at Poona to the preparation of a masterly report upon the provinces that had been taken from the Peshwa. Sir Edward Ebrooke has done well to make long extracts from this State paper, as it is a repertory of accurate knowledge and observation, while it lays out with remarkable skill and

sagacity the principles upon which the gradual introduction of the British system of law and administration into the new territory might best be accomplished. He was entrusted by the Government with the task of carrying out his own plans and views; for the Peshwa's territory was amalgamated with the Bombay Presidency, and Elphinstone became Governor of Bombay. He had now to exchange a roving and rather adventurous life, in a position where personal influence and authority had free play, for the restraints and carefully circumscribed jurisdiction of a regular government, and he was to leave the hills and rolling uplands of the Dekhan for the flat alluvial plains of Bombay proper. The change in scenery reflected the change in his associations; and the feelings with which he regarded both are recorded in the following passages from his diary:—

'Camp, Ambygaum, Oct. 26.—After sitting up at a ball and second supper till near half-past four, I left Poona at eleven, and did not get clear of petitioners, and persons taking leave, until I passed the Powna at Waukree. I afterwards occasionally stopped to look back to what could still be seen of the scenes where I have passed so many tranquil and pleasing hours. We rode on through Chandkair, and our old hunting-grounds, now rendered doubly interesting by the reflection that I should never more enjoy them. As we came near our ground the scenery improved, and at last we passed over a low ridge, and entered a beautiful valley surrounded by mountains, over which towered the hill forts of Toruj, Tekona, Esapoor, and Loghur. The first two are particularly bold and magnificent. The valley itself is divided by the Powna, and is diversified by some green and sunny knolls, scattered with fine trees. The clouds were dull and heavy, and added greatly to the beauty of the view, both by their own appearance, and by the effect of the light and shadow they produced on the landscape. I feel a sort of respect as well as attachment for this fine picturesque country which I am leaving for the flat and crowded roads of Bombay, and I cannot but think with affectionate regret of the romantic scenes and manly sports of the Deccan.'

Sir Edward Colebrooke gives an excellent and instructive account of Elphinstone's various measures and projects for improving and consolidating the internal administration of Bombay during his eight years of government, which, as is remarked, was a term of almost profound peace throughout India. He was the first in India to collect and arrange the criminal 'regulations' into the shape of a code, and he even attacked the much more difficult problem of codifying the civil law of the country, which then rested entirely, as it still does largely, on confused tradition and conflicting authorities. The first step towards this end was to ascer-

tain whether there existed among the Hindoos any treatise or scripture of universally recognised authority in civil matters. And here Elphinstone was forced to acknowledge the immense obstacles presented by the extreme variety and incoherence of different customs and ordinances for different castes and sects; but his correspondence on the subject contains much that is still worth reading by those who are now rolling uphill the huge stone of Indian codification. If you accept and declare as authoritative in our courts any particular compilation of Hindoo law, you stereotype many anachronisms and some absurdities, and you give the work a force and scope never contemplated by the loose unscientific jurists of old. If you do not accept and affirm any such traditional jurisprudence, your decisions lose the weight of authority, and are thus defective at base. In India the legislator is obliged to proceed very slowly in reducing the multifarious customs and irregular ordinances of primitive society to some common utilitarian measure of general civic rights and duties. Of this Elphinstone was well aware; he showed great caution about demolishing indigenous institutions before he could see his way to replacing them by others equally suitable and well understood of the people; and he points to Lord Cornwallis's permanent settlement of Bengal as proving that the best laid plans, the most carefully considered reforms, may nevertheless throw a country into confusion and disorganise its economy. He was much influenced by Bentham's writings, and an amusing story is told of the misunderstanding caused by his having suggested in a minute that a jail should be built on the pattern of Bentham's Panopticon—the word was misspelt Panoply by copyists, and utterly puzzled the officials. But fundamental administrative reforms will never succeed in India until the natives themselves are ready to comprehend and to criticise them, and finally to co-operate in their execution. No man saw this more clearly than Elphinstone, whose minutes on the education of the natives, which he regarded as the preliminary to all social and moral advancement, and as the first step towards admission of natives to the higher public offices, are models of statesmanlike composition. It was from him that public instruction first received the impulse that has carried it so far in Bombay. Whether Elphinstone, like all ardent and highly intellectual reformers, did not in his writings anticipate too much from education, may be questioned by those who discern, in these latter days, the extreme complexity of the political and social problems

involved in the artificial developement of India under British rule; but in his own time he was a pioneer far beyond ordinary settled opinions, and all his acts for the furtherance of education were good. The proper ways and means of gradually admitting natives to a full share in all public functions is at the present moment a question of the first interest and importance, that is still under discussion. On this question Elphinstone's ideas were most liberal, although the following extract from a private letter indicates that he may have occasionally attached too much weight to Oriental precedents. After expressing great pleasure at his correspondent's opinion in favour of the admission of natives to all offices, he goes on to say:—

‘It has always been a favourite notion of mine that our object ought to be to place ourselves in the same relation to the natives as the Tartars are to the Chinese; retaining the government and military power, but gradually relinquishing all share in the civil administration, except that degree of control which is necessary to give the whole an impulse and direction. This operation must be so gradual that it need not even alarm the Directors for their civil patronage; but it ought to be kept in mind, and all our measures ought to tend to that object.’

It is, however, essential to remember, in all our reforming designs, that the English in India are trying an experiment that no Oriental Government has ever seriously thought of undertaking, because the English alone are looking about in earnest for some method of introducing constitutional government. The Chinese system succeeds chiefly because it retains in the background, behind an apparatus of remarkable toleration and liberality, a perfectly unscrupulous and unsparing despotism, always ready to cut down any excessive aspirations of its subjects towards a share in the real power reserved by the ruling class. In China we see an absolute Government playing with infinite skill and dissimulation at liberal institutions. In India we have, conversely, the representatives of a free, conscientious, and even democratic community playing rather awkwardly at absolutism.

This remark may be illustrated from the book now before us. Within a few pages after the extracts from Elphinstone's very liberal and large-minded minutes upon the education and political advancement of natives, comes a letter in which he explains how he was obliged to depart from India a Bombay editor, on the complaint of the Chief Justice, who had quarrelled with his bar, and who considered that certain legal reports published in a newspaper ‘reflected on

‘him and on one of the judges.’ ‘Of course,’ writes Elphinstone to Strachey, ‘you admit that a free press and a ‘foreign yoke are incompatible with each other;’ and he goes on to argue that although, so far as the Europeans in India are concerned, it does not much matter whether their press is or is not free, yet all the natives, particularly the sepoys, ‘are ready to trample on the Government if they see it ‘despised by their superiors.’ And he does not think the European community, although at least two-thirds can read, ‘of sufficient importance to make it expedient to risk an ‘empire for the sake of furnishing them with amusing news-papers.’ It is not clear how Elphinstone proposed, on these principles, to accommodate the press censure (which he was, however, only exercising under strict rules framed by the Supreme Government) with a wide extension of high education among the natives; for he was too clear-headed to suppose that the risks and inconveniences, to the Indian Government, of a free press would be lessened by education. Probably he foresaw the dilemma plainly enough, but had no wish to accelerate the approach of inevitable difficulties that lay beyond his own time. He had enough to do, for the moment, in dealing with some bitter quarrels over the press regulations that sprang up between his Government and the Supreme Court; for the same Chief Justice who had demanded the deportation of editors in particular, soon after came forward as defender of press liberties in general, and threatened with fine and imprisonment those who published opposite views. This time he accused the Government of connexion with the offending newspapers; and this dispute, with a more serious controversy over a question of the Court’s jurisdiction, caused Elphinstone much annoyance during the last two years of his administration.

Elphinstone’s Indian career was now drawing to a close. When he sent in his resignation of office, in June 1825, he was within some months of completing thirty years’ uninterrupted service in India; and it is probable that even at that time so long an absence from home was rare among officers of his stamp and reputation. He went back to Poona, to pass three months in the country where he had spent his best years and built up his reputation. His diary has the following extracts:—

‘August 20.—Not being able to sleep, I got up early, and rode first to the Sungum, and then round by the coast and up to the hill where Hamilton and I went the evening before Holkar’s battle. I was

sleepy at first, and the places made little impression; but after some time the recollection of those old times returned. How totally unlike the present! The change in this place, though most complete, was the least striking; the change in myself—in all around me, in India, and in the world—is almost total; yet those days of youth were not, as might be fancied, days of thoughtless pleasure, but often of deep despondency, mixed with ardent aspirations after better things. Had the life I have since led been offered to me then, I am sure I should have rejected it with disdain. But all is now changed, and I perhaps am more fortunate in the prospect of going to my grave in obscurity than I should have been if any of my wild and visionary wishes had been realised.

'Oct. 27.—Rode to-day alone to the Kirkee bridge, visiting as I passed the little recess in the river bank where Hamilton and I used to bathe in time of old. It was quite unchanged, and everything as it then stood was fresh in my mind. I then went to Kirkee bridge, up to the village (but could not find the Belle Alliance), and rode along the places which I remembered in those times. Then looked over the quiet plains to the west, and home by and through the Sungum, which I probably saw for the last time. This gave rise to an abundance of recollections.'

He returned to Bombay, laid before his Council a valuable minute upon the administration of the Dekhan, and on its general state and progress; and from that time forward he literally counted the days intervening before the date of his departure from India. He laid down office 'among testimonies of respect and regard that have rarely been bestowed upon any public functionary;' all classes, native and European, presented addresses of encomium on his administration and regret at its close; and the Elphinstone College was founded as a lasting memorial of his exertions in the cause of education.

He wandered home through Egypt, Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy, reaching England in May 1829, after an absence of thirty-three years, and a voyage by sea and land of some eighteen months. He was at Constantinople in 1828, when the Russians were crossing the Balkans, and when the Sultan proclaimed a *Jehád*, calling on all Moslems to rally round the sacred standard. He was in the Morea when the French forced the Turks to evacuate it; he met Mr. Stratford Canning with the French camp at Messina; he visited the then famous Greek leader Colocotroni; at Venice he talked with Count Haugwitz, the Prussian ambassador who congratulated Napoleon after Austerlitz; and at Paris he saw Talleyrand, 'an odd figure, pale, with the skin of his face hanging loose, and with a great deal of hair, 'gummed and powdered.' His notes and observations

throughout the journey, as given by Sir E. Colebrooke, are excellent reading. No retiring Anglo-Indian ever made better use of the opportunity and choice of routes afforded to those who have to find their way home from Asia to England; nor would Elphinstone have envied the smooth and facile speed with which modern governors are now conveyed from Bombay to Dover in three weeks. There is no doubt that the transition from arduous and important functions, and from a position of some eminence, to vacuous leisure and the flat comforts of ordinary European life, is not the less felt by successful and superannuated officials because in these days it is rapid and sudden. So probably Elphinstone was right to profit by his Homeric studies, and to follow the example of Ulysses, who, like himself, after many exciting years of Asiatic warfare and politics, travelled home in a very leisurely manner to his quiet island in the West.

Not the least interesting part of his journal at this period is the record of his first impressions on landing in England, and while he posted up from Dover to London. He had been so long absent that his observations read like those of a very intelligent foreigner, but warmed and lighted up by old recollections, patriotic emotions, and the unspeakable pleasure of finding himself at last again in his fatherland.

‘Long after I landed I was so sick and giddy that I scarce knew what I was about. I afterwards walked about the town, and admired the extraordinary neatness of the houses and streets. The shops made full as good a show as French ones. I was struck with the number of religious books. The people in the town were *perhaps* better dressed, but certainly not better-looking, than the French. What surprised me was that they had all a slovenly lounging air, very unlike the energy and business habits one is accustomed to ascribe to them. All with whom I had anything to do were quite as civil as the French, or as was possible. I saw with delight many old objects that I have not seen since I left home. They were of the humblest description—ginger-bread figures, tin milk-pails, &c. Some servant-maid was astonished on landing at Calais to hear the children speaking French. I was almost as much startled to hear all the common people speaking English. The numerous carriages distinguished Dover from a French town. The hotel was much what one of equal celebrity would be in France, but more comfortable.

‘What astonished me most was the comfort of the people; every cottage was neat and finished, with geraniums in the windows, and often a little garden in front. Some few were of wooden frames, with lath or clay and mortar, and one or two looked just like those in France, but in general they were more like cottages at the Petit Trianon than the meanness of real life; indeed, the whole country

looks as if it were put in order for some grand holiday, and everything unpleasant put out of sight. The only disappointment is where one would least wish it, in the appearance of the people. We are certainly not better-looking than the French, and I doubt if the lower orders are even so well dressed. They have none of the ruddy appearance I expected, and those who are even approaching to the middle age look haggard and worn.'

He felt rather isolated at first, but soon found his place in London society; his meeting again with the Duke of Wellington deserves an extract.

'June 25.—I dined with the Court of Directors, a dinner to Lord Dalhousie and Sir S. Beckwith. All the Cabinet Ministers were there; some were pointed out to me, and I met several old acquaintances. A shout in the streets announced the Duke of Wellington, and presently he entered. He looked older, but much the same as in old times. The greatest change was in his softened and more courtly manner. I cannot describe the sensations produced in me by the sight of him. After some time I was told he was asking for me, and I went up to him. He received me as he would have done formerly, and talked for a minute or two; said among other things that he had grown old and grey since I saw him, and that he could not scamper about on horseback as he used to do then. I feel none of the shyness with him that I do with ordinary great men. After dinner he made a speech, not flowing and easy, like a practised speaker, but loud, distinct, and full of matter. He alluded to his serving the Company, and the interest he took in the Indian army. Many others spoke, several of them (Dalhousie, Beckwith, and Hill) plain soldiers, and no orators; but all with a self-possession that surprised and humiliated me by the comparison.'

He was offered the Persian embassy, but declined; and after a long visit to Scotland, when he noted the 'striking difference' between England and Scotland, he settled down finally in London in 1831. His journal gives various interesting and amusing glimpses of notable personages and events, particularly during the excitement of the Reform Bill and the Irish Disturbance Bill. Of the first Reformed Parliament Mr. Charles Wynne tells him, as they walk home from the House, 'that it was so deficient in courtesy 'that he could hardly fancy it the same assembly;,' a remark that suggests much speculation as to what Mr. Wynne would have thought of the manners of the House of Commons fifty years later. His account of one of the earliest debates after the Reform Act is worth preserving for the picture it has left us of a bygone generation, and for his opinion on the different orators:—

'March 4.—I went for four nights to hear the debates on the first

reading of the Irish Disturbance Bill. Great apprehensions were entertained about its reception; and when Lord Althorpe opened it in a dull, heavy, hesitating speech, its reception was not very cheering. Several other members spoke for and against with no decisive effect; but Mr. Stanley rose, and in a clear, decided, confident, and earnest speech roused the feelings and strengthened the courage of the House, and was received with long and enthusiastic cheers, which showed that the feelings of all were on the Government side, however they might have been suppressed by prudence or want of zeal. His facts and arguments differed little from Lord Althorpe's, but the effect was as different as ice and fire. I had no idea of the power of eloquence, or rather of confidence and earnestness of manner. The last part of his speech was a severe attack on O'Connell, managed with great skill, with no appearance of study, and heightened by readiness in turning occurrences of the moment to account, making O'Connell's cheers the occasion of some of the most murderous thrusts at him. Among other things O'Connell was reproached with having called the House 600 scoundrels, which he called out he would explain. The House would scarcely wait till Stanley was done, but called for an immediate explanation. When Stanley had done, and all was expectation, Sheil moved the adjournment of the House, but the cry for O'Connell was too persevering. He rose at last, and first tried conciliation, to little purpose; then manly frankness with more success, until his lame and shuffling explanation came, which was received with a burst of laughter. O'Connell was completely disconcerted, made bad worse by further attempts at explanation, and sat down amid the strongest marks of reprobation from almost every side. The other speakers of note were Tennyson—clear, fluent enough, but with too much and too undignified action, in both which defects he is far surpassed by Lytton Bulwer, who has even more fluency, but with a lisp and a weak voice.'

At the end of 1834 the Whig Ministry was dismissed, and Lord Ellenborough at once offered to Elphinstone, first, the permanent Under-Secretaryship of the Board of Control, and, secondly, the Governor-Generalship of India; but both appointments were resolutely declined. In regard to India, he considered his health to be 'an insuperable impediment;' but it is also curious to find how little importance he attached at the time to the Governor-Generalship, which was twice proposed to him. In September 1834, when the Chairman of the Court of Directors wishes to submit his name for the office, he writes: 'The probable employment of the next Governor-General will be, like that of the last, economy and details of civil administration, with the amendment of the Code, and settlement of questions arising from the late Act.' And again (1835):

'As Governor-General of India, I should only have had to cut and clip; my health certainly would not have stood it for six months; but

if there had been the least prospect of usefulness or distinction, I should not have thought of my health for a single moment. I am much cooled since old times, but I would still give all the rest of my life with delight for one moment of real glory.'

Mr. Elphinstone had certainly no gift of second sight when he predicted thus of a period which, under Lord Auckland, witnessed the most memorable and tragic series of events, political and military, that our Indian history records.

'It is probable,' Sir Edward Colebrooke observes, 'that if he had attempted the great charge of India his health would have soon broken down, as it did only a few years later. One might otherwise have been tempted to speculate on the change in the course of history which might have resulted from his presence in India when the Russian alarm was at its height. Mr. Elphinstone once told me that he saw the destinies of Europe very nearly changed by a fish-bone; General Wellesley was nearly choked by a fish-bone at his own table. Lord Ellenborough, at the public meeting held in Mr. Elphinstone's honour after his decease, boldly declared that had he gone to India there would have been no Afghan war. It is certain that he would not have counselled that unfortunate enterprise; and it is improbable that the Ministry of the day would have sent to a statesman of his knowledge and experience such peremptory instructions as those which were said to have crossed in midsea the announcement of the decision of Lord Auckland's government.'

Leaving to other hands India's future, Elphinstone preferred to write its past history; he settled down resolutely to his work for a time, and the volumes that he completed have taken a permanent place in all Indian libraries. But just as he had entered upon his account of the growth of the English power in Bengal under Clive and Hastings, Macaulay's essays appeared. He seems to have been dazzled and disheartened, unfortunately, by their brilliancy; he decided that Macaulay had treated the period dramatically, and Mill philosophically, in a manner that left him no excuse for going over the same ground, and that he was content to fail as an historian with Fox and Mackintosh. So he abandoned his work in a fit of despondency, mainly attributable to his failing health; and we have thus lost a history which, so far from being superfluous, would have supplied manifest deficiencies, and would have succeeded just in those qualities, and in those parts of the subject, where the shortcomings and misapprehensions of Mill and Macaulay are now clearly visible. Mill's history is not readable enough; Macaulay's essays are so entertaining as to be almost too readable; the influence they have acquired is far

beyond their historical value. Mill had no sympathy at all with the English in India, and he did not properly understand the structure of Asiatic states or societies; Macaulay saw at a glance the whole panorama of the wreck of the Moghal empire, and the tossing sea of political confusion into which the English plunged so boldly; but he is at times wonderfully inaccurate, and he had not the profound understanding of Asia that only comes from long sojourn among an Asiatic people. It is because Elphinstone, who was strong where preceding writers on India had been weak, left his work unfinished, that the following observation is as true now as it was when Elphinstone wrote it fifty years ago.

‘With all the loose information we possess about the East, there is no book that gives an idea of the principles of an Asiatic government, or the structure of Asiatic society. It is only by a good history that such knowledge can be imparted, and India is the only country where we have sufficient materials to allow a hope of such a history being ever produced.’

The declining years of Elphinstone’s life passed very quietly. It is indeed remarkable that (if we may judge from the extracts) the references in his papers to the extraordinary and momentous events which fill the annals of India from 1840 to 1858, are neither frequent nor very important. Lord Dalhousie’s annexation of the Sattara principality shocked him, for its establishment had been a cardinal point of his Maratha policy, though the annexation of the Punjab, and even of Oude, received his approval. He knew that, as we are now discovering to our cost in Egypt, there is no middle path between taking over altogether an Oriental country and leaving it altogether to its own devices; and he was inclined to give the King of Oude the choice of ceding his territories or of attempting to govern them without British connexion or support; but this was chiefly out of a kind of scientific predilection for political experiments. The Mutiny he discusses coolly and philosophically in a letter dated September 1857, when the storm was at its height, observing that foreign governments have kept their ground in worse circumstances than ours, and mentioning ancient Rome as an illustration. Much of his latest correspondence appears to have been occupied with the political and military questions involved in the reorganisation of the home government of India, and in the remodelling of the Indian army, to which he evidently attached paramount importance. In 1859 he died.

Sir Edward Colebrooke concludes a work that he has performed with much judgement and discrimination by a few

remarks on the high qualities, moral and intellectual—rare in themselves, still rarer in union—that characterised Mountstuart Elphinstone. Those who knew him are now very few, but those who have come after him are indebted to Sir Edward Colebrooke for a narrative that brings out into clear light and delineates the features of a man who has left us, on the whole, the best example of an Anglo-Indian diplomatist and administrator. The work is the more valuable because times and circumstances have so changed that the Indian services, whatever else they produce, will not bring back the type represented by Elphinstone. No young Indian officer can now travel slowly from one side of India to the other, with a supply of classic authors, and with ample time and opportunity for studying the people, and thus preparing himself for an early initiation into the vicissitudes of a stormy political epoch. The time is past when Indian states were loose conglomerations of territory, the spoils of successful war, that were easily dissolved by a defeat. It was Elphinstone's fortune to accompany conquering armies, and to be entrusted with the duty of bringing order out of the confusion caused by each shock of war, and of redistributing large territories upon some durable political basis. His time was one of simple, straightforward action, when the problems of Indian politics lay within the old-fashioned sphere of war and diplomacy; when the great issues were between the English Power and the chiefs who contended with it for predominance in India, the Indian people remaining passive lookers-on at the contest. He had no concern, until quite at the end of his career, with the more complex and subtle difficulties of a later stage in India's developement, when the English have to deal, not with intractable or incapable Indian chiefs and princes, but with a vast population, among whose leaders superficial culture has produced rhetoric, and who are just coming into possession of political liberty, so fair a prize when gained by a nation's own exertions, so dangerous as a free gift. Other times bring other men, and we cannot expect to look on Elphinstone's like again; but his reputation will survive as a tradition in the Indian services, and his *Life* should be read by all who desire to understand the middle period of the expansion of England's dominion in India.

- ART. VI.—1. *The River Congo, from its Mouth to Bólóbó.*
By H. H. JOHNSTON, F.Z.S., F.R.G.S. London: 1884.
2. *Les Voyages de Savorgnan de Brazza; Ogóoué et Congo*
(1875–1882). Par D. NEUVILLE et CH. BRÉARD. Paris:
1884.
3. *Die Loango Expedition ausgesandt von der Deutschen Gesellschaft zur Erforschung Aequatorial-Africa's* (1873–1876).
Ein Reisewerk in drei Abtheilungen von PAUL GÜSSFELDT, JULIUS FALKENSTEIN, EDUARD PECHÜEL-LOESCHE.
Leipzig: 1879–82.
4. *Quatre Années au Congo.* Par CHARLES JEANNEST.
Paris: 1883.
5. *Angola and the River Congo.* By JOACHIM JOHN MONTEIRO. London: 1875.
6. *Correspondence relating to Negotiations between the Governments of Great Britain and Portugal for the Conclusion of the Congo Treaty: 1882–84.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament. 1884.
7. *Further Papers relating to Negotiations with Portugal.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament. 1884.

THE forgotten heart of Africa has all at once become an object of competition to Europe. Of competition interested and disinterested—of competition religious and scientific, political and commercial, indefinitely varied in motive, method, and event, but always keen, ardent, and, for the future of both continents, momentous beyond prevision or calculation. A singular spectacle it is, that at which we are privileged to assist. The impetuous overflow into a new channel of the energies at once fostered and pent up by the conditions of modern life; the disclosure, for the first time to civilised man, of no inconsiderable portion of the habitable surface of our globe; the sudden development of its untouched and teeming resources; the disturbance and readjustment thence ensuing to the complicated trade relations of the world; the appropriation, by every science relating to the earth and its inhabitants, of inestimable stores of fresh observation; the working-out of what might be called an anthropological experiment on the vastest scale, involving the destinies of uncounted millions of degraded human beings; and all these separate elements of agitated progress dramatised, as it were, before our eyes by

the clash of emulous interests, and the swift activity of nations and individuals.

The enormous central mass of tropical Africa seemed as if foredoomed by nature to isolation. North and south it is hemmed in by thirst; east and west by fever; and, lest deserts and swamps should prove ineffectual, cataracts and rapids are added. Each of the four principal approaches to the fortress is barred by tumbling and swirling reaches of foaming water. Here, then, the conquests of civilisation must be by assault rather than by a simple advance. That assault is even now being delivered, in combined form, upon the barricaded approaches constituted by the Nile, the Niger, the Zambesi, and the Congo, and the politics of the civilised world are sensibly affected by the simultaneous advance of the Christian Powers on all the African coasts, Morocco, Algiers, Tunis, Egypt, the Red Sea, Madagascar, South Africa, and the Congo.

The modern epoch of exploration in Central Africa dates from the discovery by Burton and Speke in 1858 of the great equatorial lakes of Tanganyika and Victoria Nyanza. Thenceforward it was no longer doubtful that a populous and fertile region, almost doubling the extent of Europe, awaited and would repay disclosure; and an unbroken succession of heroic travellers and devoted missionaries have not ceased to respond to the joint appeal of humanity, scientific curiosity, and commercial enterprise. These scattered efforts have of late been aided by the action of an organised and organising body. Although eight years have not yet elapsed since its foundation, the International African Association already takes rank amongst the great powers of the world. The brief history of its development is one replete with curious instruction.

In September 1876, a conference met at Brussels with a view to afford the means of combining their energies to all, without distinction of country, interested in the welfare of Africa. An Association was formed, of which his Majesty the King of the Belgians accepted the presidentship; and to his royal munificence and zealous personal supervision the extraordinary success, so far, of one of the most conspicuous and, at least in its inception, one of the noblest enterprises of our time, is mainly due. The objects of the Association were such as would, it was hoped, appease national rivalry and secure universal co-operation. Excluding and disclaiming all purposes of political or mercantile aggrandisement, they rested on the broadest principles

of philanthropy and civil culture. The abolition of the slave trade, the rescue from barbarism of a large section of the human race, the enlargement of geographical and scientific knowledge, were alone aimed at; and the means designed to be used for the securing of those ends were of an equally peaceable, disinterested, and irreproachable character with the ends themselves.

Let us pause to remember that twice before a similar design was formed, and proved abortive. João II. of Portugal (1481-95) did not limit his ambition to exploring the coasts, but aspired to penetrate and christianise the interior of Africa,* and conceived the bold idea, as well of striking out across the unknown continent a route to India, as of joining hands, in the interests of humanity and the growth of knowledge, with Prester John, the legendary monarch whose seat the critical faculty of the time had transferred from the steppes of Tartary to the highlands of Abyssinia. Nor did his successors at once abandon the lofty project. Gregorio de Quadra was, in 1521, despatched to the Congo with instructions to attempt the Abyssinian adventure; and although his mission came to nothing, the maps of the period attest the extensive and approximately correct acquaintance of the Portuguese with the main lines of African hydrography, derived, it is supposed, from far-reaching excursions made in the company of native traders.

Again, the African Association, founded at London in 1783, anticipated many of the designs of its 'International' successor. Its fortune, however, in carrying them into execution was widely different. It enlisted the services of Mungo Park, but none of the expeditions promoted by it prospered; and, having done its work by directing public attention to evils which it was powerless to remedy, it yielded its prominent position, in 1807, to the more purely humanitarian 'African Institution.'

In 1876 the prospect of regenerating Africa, though still remote, was conspicuously brighter than in 1788. The prohibition of the slave trade and negro emancipation had closed the market of the West against human merchandise; the opprobrium of supplying it was thus removed from the whole Atlantic coast of the negro-producing continent, and legitimate commerce, long stifled by the noxious growth of an unhallowed traffic, began to revive. In the eastern parts the 'great open sore of the world' was indeed festering; but

* Cordeiro, '*L'Hydrographie Africaine au xv^e Siècle*,' p. 8.

it was at least laid bare, and the increasing abhorrence with which it was regarded strengthened, year by year, the hopes of its ultimate and complete removal. From Zanzibar the route to the equatorial lakes had been so often trodden by European travellers as to have become almost a beaten path, in which discomfiture by robbery or desertion, but no novelty of adventure or discovery, was to be looked for; and the savage court of Uganda by the shores of Lake Victoria, no less than the Arab trading and slaving settlement of Ujiji on Tanganyika, had become the familiar rendezvous of the pioneers of light in the dark heart of Africa. From the east, then, the International Association resolved to begin its labours, proceeding thence, step by step, westward as time and opportunity should admit. A chain of posts, forming so many oases of culture in the wilderness of barbarism, was thus gradually to be drawn across the whole of the as yet trackless equatorial region, and beneficent enterprise of every kind was to be assured, at convenient intervals, a refuge, a starting-point, and a link of communication with the extra-African world. They were to be, in short, ganglia in a vast nervous system of civilising influences. The first international station, then, was founded in August 1879 at Karema, on the eastern declivity of the rifted hollow forming Lake Tanganyika, and a second, on the western shore, has since been added. In the meantime, however, an event had occurred by which a totally new complexion was given to African enterprise. Stanley had crossed the continent by the great waterway of the Congo.

Three hundred miles off the West Coast the Atlantic waves are reported by seamen to be still troubled and discoloured by the expiring ripples of the impetuous flood poured into the ocean under the sixth parallel of south latitude. Closer inshore the rush of waters is so powerful as seriously to impede navigation. 'The Zaire,' Samuel Purchas relates, 'is of such force that no ship can get in against the current but near to the shore; yea, it prevails against the ocean's saltness threescore, or, as some say, fourscore miles within the sea before his proud waves yield their full homage, and receive that salt temper in token of subjection.*' The less figurative language of Findlay's 'Sailing Directions' informs us that at forty miles from its mouth the waters of the river are still brackish, while at nine miles (or even, as others say, at twelve) they are at

times quite fresh. Floating islands of bamboo, frequently one hundred paces long and as many wide, with trees and shrubs erect, and perhaps some captive craft torn from its anchorage entangled, helpless, amidst reeds and grasses, are swept far out to sea during the floods, when the noise of the advancing stream suggests, even before land is sighted, the roar of a mountain torrent among rocks, and the deep, turbid red of its waves contrasts singularly with the clear blue of the Atlantic.

The Congo, unlike most other great rivers, has no delta. When, by its own labours of erosion and deposition, its actual channel shall be so far obstructed as to make fresh means of exit desirable, they will no doubt be found; and the excavation of such auxiliary branches is even suspected to have already begun.* But at present it discharges into the sea by a single, unbroken estuary, $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles across, in which a sounding-line of 200 fathoms does not everywhere touch bottom, and a current runs of five to seven knots an hour. The enormous volume of the outflow may, from these data, be imperfectly estimated; and, in point of fact, the Congo, although overmatched, as regards the length of its course, by more than one rival stream, stands second only to the Amazon for the unvarying copiousness of its waters. Captain Burton places at the surprising figure of *at least 2,500,000 cubic feet per second*† the volume of water borne by it; and the admitted and sober estimate is 2,000,000. Now the Mississippi, when at the height of its March flood, carries down no more than 1,150,000; it sinks in November to 228,000, and its mean discharge is 675,000 cubic feet a second; while the Ganges has less than a third of the contents of the giant stream of North America. Moreover, the Congo never runs low. It swells, indeed, and sinks, as the rainy and dry seasons succeed each other; but within a relatively narrow range of oscillation. Such extreme inequalities as are observed in the Nile and the Niger are here partially compensated by the alternating periods of affluents drawing their stores from opposite sides of the equator. At Boma, accordingly, the difference between the levels of the river in January, when it is highest, and in August, when it is lowest, does not exceed four or five feet, though higher up, in the narrows, it may amount to twelve, or even sixteen.

* Johnston, 'The River Congo,' p. 22.

† Two Trips to Gorilla Land, vol. ii. p. 154.

This noble stream was first made known to Europe through the enterprise of a hardy Portuguese navigator. Diogo Cam, commissioned by João II. to extend the scope and enhance the glory of his reign by maritime discovery, reached its mouth in 1484, and planted, in token of Portuguese supremacy, an inscribed column on its southern shore. The river (which has borne as many names as the Moon-goddess) hence became known as the *Rio do Padrão*, or River of the Pillar. But in a chart of 1513 the name of the 'Congo' (*Rio de Manicongo*) appeared, and has prevailed. It was derived from the then powerful and well-organised native kingdom of Congo (*Mani-Congo* signifies 'king' of Congo), since disintegrated into a multitude of sordid chieftainships, through which the stream flowed to the sea. The euphonious appellation of the 'Zaire'—a corruption of the local title *Nzuli*, 'river'—was first used by De Barros, in his 'Decades' (1552), and was consecrated by the verse of Camoens:

'Alli o mui grande reino està de Congo,
Por nós já convertido á fé de Christo,
Por onde o Zaire passa claro e longo,
Rio pelos antigos nunca visto.'*

Within the last few years Mr. Stanley has endeavoured, but without success, to associate the Congo with the name and eminent services of Livingstone; while in its higher reaches—a striking testimony to the narrow circumscription of tribal horizons—its native designations rival in number, and are frequently borrowed from, those of its tributaries.

The origin of this mighty equatorial drain long remained involved in obscurity, for the uncertain tradition which derived it from a central lacustrine reservoir could not satisfy, and was accordingly rejected by, the criticisms of later geographers. Nevertheless, they could substitute for the rude indications they rejected only the blank of total ignorance, or hypotheses utterly misleading. An expedient much favoured was that of piecing together the upper course of the Niger with the lower course of the Congo, and so abolishing at once the twofold perplexity shrouding the exit of the one and the rise of the other stream. It was with this view, and under this firm persuasion, that a double expedition was despatched from England in 1816, to *descend* the Niger, and to *ascend* the Congo. Both were equally

* Os Lusíadas, v. xiii.

unfortunate. The climate effectually guarded the secret sought to be explored, and exacted an overwhelming penalty for the attempt, in the mortality by which all the leading men of each party were swept away. Captain Tuckey, however, mounted the Congo for 280 miles, discovered the formidable Yellala and Isangila cataracts, and surveyed the almost unknown channel above the slave-market of Embomma (now Boma). When, in 1830, the voyage of the brothers Lander demonstrated the independence of the Niger by tracing it to its multipartite issue in the Gulf of Guinea, the associated problem of the Congo received an aggravation of its difficulties. Nor were they removed for nearly half a century; and then the solution came from the other side of the continent. For it is worthy of note that the course of none of the chief rivers of Africa has been successfully explored unless from above; the defences with which they are armed having proved assailable only when taken, as it were, in the rear.

On March 31, 1871, at Nyangwe, some two hundred miles west of Lake Tanganyika, Dr. Livingstone stood on the bank of a great river rolling a dark-brown flood, at the rate of two miles an hour, towards the north.* With the earlier stages of its career he was already in some degree acquainted; he had, indeed, contributed more than any other towards their elucidation. Rising in the Mapurumuka Mountains,† a couple of score of miles east and south of the southern extremity of Tanganyika, at an altitude of 4,600 feet above the sea, it assumes from the first, under the name of the Chambeze, the character of a majestic stream; forms and traverses the vast sheet of Lake Bangweolo; leaves it, as the Luapula, to reverse its southern flow, and fill the extensive basin of Lake Moero; whence it emerges, with the title and bulk of the Lualaba, to bear past Nyangwe, in the lowest ebb of the dry season, an estimated volume of 124,000 cubic feet of water per second. The more attentively Livingstone considered these imposing proportions, the more intimately he became convinced that he had before his eyes the upper course of the Nile—the true aqueous trunk, of which the Victoria Nile was only one of the principal branches. He refused to believe—although his persuasion was aided by desire, and not untroubled by misgiving—that any inferior stream to that of the Pharaohs and the Pyramids could

* Last Journals, vol. ii. p. 111.

† Geographische Mittheilungen, I., 1884, p. 37.

present, from the first, so noble an aspect. And in the fatal and fallacious pursuit of a discovery to which he clung with tenacious enthusiasm, as the destined crown of an illustrious career, he died in the wilderness, May 4, 1873.

In truth, the comparison of volumes, as well as of levels, rendered his supposition an impossible one. The Lualaba carries nineteen times as much water as the Bahr-el-Ghazal, with which Livingstone's cherished theory necessarily identified it, and three times as much as the Bahr-el-Abiad, or White Nile, after its junction with its western affluent.* Moreover, the valley of the Lualaba lies so considerably *below* the valley of the Upper Nile as to enlist the force of gravity on the wrong side of the question. But, if not the Nile, the Lualaba could be no other than the Congo; and of this view Stanley's memorable voyage in 1877 was the practical demonstration. It not only furnished the definitive solution of a long outstanding geographical problem, but opened a way of communication across a vast and populous region of as yet unmeasured capabilities. It offered a new world to philanthropy, civilisation, science, commerce—a new world to be rescued, elevated, explored, catalogued, and brought to market.

The International African Association was prompt to seize the full bearings of the situation. On November 25, 1878, the Comité d'Études du Haut Congo was formed; the scene of most energetic action was shifted from the eastern to the western verge of the African plateau; and the services and commanding genius of Stanley were engaged to render practicable for unadventurous intercourse the magnificent but arduous route which he had been the first to traverse. Of the difficulties obstructing the enterprise, and of the inducements to vanquish those difficulties, we will now attempt to give some idea.

The whole of Central Africa constituted in ancient times, according to the conjecture of geologists, one vast inland sea, of which the present lake-systems are the scattered and diminished representatives. Through the channels of the Nile, the Zambesi, and the Congo, when these rivers

* See Dr. E. Behm's 'Beweise für die Identität des Lualaba mit dem Congo,' Geogr. Mitth. 1872, p. 405. A translation will be found in 'Proceedings R. Geogr. Soc.,' vol. xvii. p. 21. *In intention*, Cameron anticipated Stanley's confirmatory journey; *in action*, circumstances were too obdurate for him, pushing his route further south.

had found or forced their several issues to the coast, the superfluous waters gradually drained off, leaving exposed a boundless field for the riotous prodigality of tropical vegetation, and the restricted needs of savage man. The western edge of this elevated interior basin is flanked by a massive bulwark of Cambrian rocks, hardly rising to the dignity, yet bristling with the asperities, of a mountain range. This mass of slate, sandstone, quartzite, and shales, 200 miles across, and 1,500 to 2,500 or 3,000 feet in altitude, runs approximately parallel to and at an average distance of perhaps fifty miles from the coast, here and there showing traces of the volcanic action by which its elevation was doubtless accompanied. This formidable barrier the Congo alone has completely succeeded in penetrating. Other rivers debouching on the West Coast—the Ogowe, the Kuilu, the Quanza—take their rise within its gullies and hillsides; but for the extensive overflow of the equatorial rains no more than one waste-pipe is provided. It is necessarily such a capacious one as we find it.

The passage, however, is not easily effected. Throughout, it bears the marks of struggle and violence. Too impetuous to be arrested, the strong rush of the stream is continually harassed by obstructions, which produce and appear in the thirty-two cataracts of the Middle Congo.

Below all is smooth. At the very mouth of the estuary, on its northern shore, a commodious harbour is formed and protected by a narrow spit of land, fortified against the encroachments of the river on one side, and the sea on the other, by arts with which the Dutch—its earliest occupants—have become familiar in their native country. Here is situated the important settlement called—*lucus à non lucendo*—‘Banana,’ no specimen of that invaluable plant being discoverable in the neighbourhood. The most prominent feature in the vegetation for a score and upwards of miles along the river—as far, indeed, as mud and brackish water extend—is the amphibious mangrove,—the pile-dweller, it might be said, amongst trees—raising itself on a tangled mass of subaerial roots above the swamps which it haunts, embowers, and eventually solidifies into dry land. Behind, ‘the Bush’ stretches inland; a magnificent growth, such as the Tropics alone can show, of palms in infinite variety—giant-palms, dwarf-palms, wine-palms, oil-palms, date-palms (*Phoenix spinosa*)—of stately bombaxes, flecked with the snowy tufts of their bursting seed-pods, delicate acacias,

ungainly baobabs, hung over, like a Christmas tree, with waxen flowers and pink-fleshed calabashes—all profusely intertwined and festooned with parasite creepers, and here and there illuminated, through the gloom of over-arching foliage, with a vivid blaze of ardent colour.

‘Our adjectives,’ Mr. Johnston says, in the agreeably written description of his recent visit to the Congo, of which we have placed the title at the head of this article, ‘are too puny to describe fitly the vegetation of such places as Kissangé [21 miles above Banana]. We want to express ourselves in the tongues of Central Africa, which have sometimes seven different terms to express different kinds of forest. Beyond the actual enclosures of the factories here, there is a splendour of vegetable growth that defies an adequate rendering either with the brush or the pen. The hot sun and the oozy mud call into existence a plant life which must parallel in rank luxuriance and monstrous growth the forests of the coal-measures, and reproduce for our eyes in these degenerate days somewhat of the majesty of the vegetable kingdom in bygone epochs.’ (P. 32.)

These imposing solitudes are such only so far as man is concerned; animal life swarms, thriving on the mutual destruction which its superabundance evokes, yet scarcely seems to control. In this department of observation, Mr. Johnston’s skill as a naturalist renders his testimony of especial value. The lagoons, abundantly fed with the alms of the adjacent river, are, he tells us,

‘the homes and feeding-grounds of myriad forms of life: of blue land-crabs, whose burrows riddle the black soil; of always alert and agitated “mud-fish,” flapping and flopping through the ooze; of tiny amethystine red-beaked kingfishers; of kingfishers that are black and white, or large and grey and speckled; of white egrets, of the brown and stork-like *scopus umbretta*; of spur-winged geese; and of all-devouring *Gypohierax* vultures. A rustling in the vegetation, and a large venomous lizard slips into the water; or on some trampled bank a crocodile lies asleep in the warm sun, with a fixed smirk hanging about his grim muzzle.’ (P. 36.)

Further on, beneath ‘the forest’s solemn canopies,’ red-fronted barbets sit meditative or disconsolate on the twigs; little African woodpeckers creep up the branches; large green mantises lie in wait for flies, and occasionally find the defence by mimicry of their surroundings, with which Nature has cunningly provided them, fail before the keen discernment and keener appetite of a blue roller bird.

‘Out of the bosky trees little troops of black and white hornbills suddenly start and flap their loose, irregular flight to another refuge. Violet plantain-eaters gleam out, in their beauty, from time to time; golden cuckoos, yellow-vented bulbuls, green fruit-pigeons, grey

parrots—parrots that are grey and blue and yellow-shouldered, green love-birds, and a multitude of little waxbills, a medley of diverse and beautiful birds enliven this walk through the forest along the black peat path, with their loud cries, their lovely plumage, and their rapid movements.' (P. 38.)

For mammalia, there are 'harnessed' antelopes, bushbucks, lemurs, civet cats, and leopards; hippopotami are less common than in the higher reaches; monkeys are unexpectedly scarce. Snakes, too, shine by absence.

At Ponta da Lenha, some thirty-five miles from Banana, ocean-navigation ceases, although the upper channel is at all times safe for vessels drawing fully twelve feet of water. The river here divides into three branches, having a collective width of five miles, inclusive of numerous islands—some waving with palms, others thickly clothed with reeds and tall grasses, among which the crowned papyrus is pre-eminent, and all thronged with innumerable water-fowl. At Boma, thirty miles higher up, the 'true trough of the Congo' (as Captain Burton expresses it) is entered. Constricted by rocky banks, gradually rising, as the barrier-district is more deeply penetrated, to precipitous heights of 1,000 feet, the stream rushes and swirls, as if impatient for the freedom of the plain. It exchanges, in a word, more and more completely its character of a great water highway for that of a mountain torrent on a gigantic scale. At Vivi, 115 miles from the coast, this unwelcome transformation becomes unmistakable. Here the region of cataracts begins which terminates at Stanley Pool—a distance, directly traversed, of 140 miles, but lengthened out by the uneasy sinuosities of the vexed water to 230. The last and most terrible stage of Stanley's descending journey was here, when the river seemed to have become endowed with a demoniac power of almost personal malignity, from the long struggle with which he came out victorious, but with hair whitened as if by the lapse of half a lifetime.

The principal falls are those of Yellala, Isangila (Tuckey's 'Sangalla'), and Ntombo (one mile above Manyanga). These duly foam and roar, their menacing voices being heard (as the natives say) to 'speak' over a circuit of many miles. Their impressive effect, however, is due rather to the prodigious volume of the flood they exasperate, than to the magnitude of the obstacles they interpose. Indeed, the last alone attains the dimensions of a 'fall;' the others may rather be considered as 'limiting instances' between falls and rapids. In all, thirty-two distinct obstructions are

ordinarily counted, some of which are separated by long stretches of navigable, though tumultuous, water.

The shores of the river are scarcely more practicable for travel than its surface. The rolling uplands, through which it has cut its way to the sea, are intersected by numerous, profound, and precipitous ravines, the work and the beds of multitudinous torrents. The red colour of the adhesive surface-soil, and the chalybeate nature of the springs, attest the abundant presence of iron; while the protrusion of bare masses of grey rock, and the profuse sprinkling of boulders and splinters of 'suet-coloured' quartz, add to the harshness, without relieving the monotony, of the landscape. The labour of traversing these endless groups of separate elevations is indefinitely aggravated by the gigantic and *ferocious* grasses (we use the word advisedly)—standing six to ten, or even sixteen feet high—with which they are not so much clothed as defended. Grass in Africa bears much the same relation to the tender herbage of our English meadows that a crocodile watching for his prey on a tropical river-bank bears to the harmless lizard that slips unheeded across a woodland path in Devonshire. It shows the full capabilities for offence of the structure. The graminaceous foes of the traveller are separately armed for cutting, bruising, and pricking; they drench him with hoarded moisture; they discharge upon him showers of barbed missiles; they obstruct his sight; they entangle his feet; they form an ambush for his foes. Their reign, however, is not perennial. When, with the advance of the rainless season, the grassy jungle becomes dry and sere, the natives set it on fire, no otherwise than in the days when Hanno and his Phœnicians were terrified by the 'igneous floods' with which, night after night, the unknown torrid shore was deluged. These annual conflagrations present a curious, and sometimes an imposing, spectacle, as they sweep in billowy volumes of smoke and fire over the hills, attended by rapacious flocks of eagles, vultures, and hawks, watching to pounce on the half-grilled vermin unhoused by the unlooked-for calamity. Against their ravages the native villages are protected by thick hedges of cactus and euphorbia; nor do they attack the forests sheltered by the deep valley-bottoms, and affording a secure habitation to the chief part of the fauna of the district—buffaloes, antelopes, leopards, flocks of hissing and whistling monkeys, with an occasional migratory elephant.

At Stanley Pool a new region—the region of the Upper Congo—opens. It is not difficult to foresee that here,

during many future decades or centuries, will be placed a focus of European intercourse with, and influence upon, Central Africa. Hither the native trade-routes converge; from hence upwards the great river can be navigated for close upon a thousand miles, with steamers equal to the largest of those that ply upon the Mississippi; * from hence, too, its tributaries, in comparison with many of which the Thames at London Bridge or the Elbe at Magdeburg is an insignificant stream, offer 4,520 miles† of open water, giving access to an area of 900,000 square miles of country, perhaps the most fertile on the face of the globe.

Stanley Pool is a rudely circular expanse twenty-three miles in diameter,‡ the unruffled tranquillity of which affords a marked and pleasing contrast to the furious agitations of the foaming tracts below. It is formed by the separation or decay of the picturesque sandstone bluffs which guard the course of the river as it descends in a south-easterly direction from the Equator. With eyes hungry for home, Stanley seized a reminiscence of England in the resplendent white ridge surmounted with emerald verdure stretching to his right as he entered the Pool from above; and, though the likeness be scarcely more than skin-deep, it has since then borne the name of 'Dover Cliffs.' The lacustrine scene thus heralded is varied by many islands, some affording a foothold to noble specimens of the palm tribe, some mere floating rafts of bamboo and papyrus; enlivened by the operations and cries of a busy populace of ibises, parrots, pelicans, cormorants, adjutants, scissors-bills, spur-winged geese, scarlet-beaked terns, by the heavy plunge of a hippopotamus, or the snort and splash of a buffalo; softened by the gentle undulations of the folded hills, clad in the velvety plumage of primeval forest, or in perfumed draperies of jasmine and landolphia; while a background of more distant and elevated ranges adds a dignity the spectator is too much pleased and occupied to miss.

The surface of this lake (for so it may be called) lies—in round numbers—1,000 feet above the sea, and is removed

* See a paper by Mr. J. Stevenson on 'The Water Highways of the Interior of Africa,' published in the Proceedings of the Philosophical Society of Glasgow, vol. xiv. (1883) p. 197. Mr. Johnston, however, came upon some very troublesome shoals before reaching Bólóbó.

† This is Stanley's estimate, and includes the main stream.

‡ For an account of its circumnavigation by the Rev. T. J. Comber, see Proc. R. Geogr. Soc. Feb. 1884, p. 71.

from it 345 miles by the devious course of the river, or about 280 in a straight line. The climate is all that could be desired. During the hottest season the thermometer seldom rises above 87° in the shade, and with due attention to the native precaution of building on elevated ground, there appears little reason to fear malaria. Indeed, even the coast-region is less inevitably deadly to Europeans than is often supposed; nor can the Congo vie with the Niger and Gambia in pestilential energy. Certain points, it is true, reek with miasma; especially such intermediate ones as Ponta da Lenha, too far inland to feel the invigorating effects of the sea-breeze, and not far enough inland to attain the cooler air of the hills; and the habits of many of our countrymen settled on the West Coast are unfortunately such as to render them peculiarly liable to imbibe and succumb to its influence. It is a melancholy but undeniable fact that alcoholic excesses very effectually conspire with fever to swell the death-roll of British subjects in Africa. The reckless orgies of past years are, indeed, happily no longer heard of; but there is still room for amendment.

Imprudences less reprehensible, but sometimes scarcely less fatal, are those of the enterprising and increasing class of explorers. Defiant or dogmatic too frequently, they arrive fresh from Europe in all the confidence of youth, determined to ignore, or projecting to disarm, the climate, and discover too late that the climate will admit neither of being for so much as a day ignored, nor of being at any time wholly disarmed. Mistaken theories of health have to answer for the loss of many valuable lives. In former times blood-letting was regarded as the great prophylactic against fever, and a new-comer to the coast was held to be insecure until the whole of his *European-made* blood had been drained off, and replaced by vital fluid of African manufacture. Hence the lancet had perhaps as much to do with the wholesale slaughter of the members of Tuckey's expedition as the sun and the swamps. Even now the use of indigestible and innutritious food is by some hygienic *doctrinaires* advocated on the illusory plea that the adoption of native habits must entail the acquisition of native immunity, one burden more being thereby added to the already burdened constitution. It should, on the contrary, be carefully borne in mind that unwise abstinence approaches, though by no means equals in destructiveness, unwise indulgence.

The truth is that fair health can only be maintained in

tropical climates by constant vigilance and frequent self-denial, and vigilance and self-denial are usually more praised than practised. Yet the question of European existence is, after all, fundamental to the question of European influence in Africa.

Since, across the broad equatorial belt of the earth, the rains follow the sun, and the sun passes twice a year through the zenith of each spot, there is a corresponding double wet season, recalling the 'early and the latter rains' of Scripture. On the Congo the summer extends from October to far on in May, bringing a long series of torrential and prolonged showers, broken only by an interlude of two months—known as the 'little dries'—in December and January. Even this is encroached upon above Stanley Pool. Terrific thunderstorms accompany the 'greater monsoon' (February to May); but the lightnings are, with the rarest exceptions, perfectly harmless. During the 'cacimbo,' or dry season (June to September inclusive), the sun is rarely seen in a clear sky; dense fogs veil his rising and setting, and are commonly persistent enough to spare those sensitive to his rays the trouble of carrying an umbrella. A sere and forbidding air is then worn by the landscape. The ascendancy of evergreens preserves, indeed, much of its opulence of foliage to the forest, though without the festive decorations of the flowering season; but the aspect of the more open savannahs, scorched by drought and devastated by frequent conflagrations, is altogether lugubrious, and is not enlivened by the gaunt presence of leafless baobabs, standing exposed in nude and colossal grotesqueness.

The rise of the Congo corresponds very imperfectly with the progress of the seasons at its mouth. So distant, so various, and so ample are the sources of its supply, that local reinforcements produce relatively little effect. Its waters have two maxima—a principal one in December and January, and a secondary one in April and May, the former depending upon the flood-time of its southern, the latter upon that of its northern affluents. From a comparison of their respective amounts it is estimated that the tribute delivered on the left bank of the river exceeds that coming from the right in the proportion of nine to two.*

More easily and concisely could it be told what are not, than what are, the productions of the favoured tracts watered by this majestic stream. The generous yield of all the

* Stevenson, 'Proc. Phil. Soc. of Glasgow,' vol. xiv. p. 212.

characteristic riches of the tropics is there found to involve no conditions excluding the cultivation of the choicest delicacies of the temperate zone. Most European vegetables thrive even on the coast: vines bear abundantly; root crops can be obtained from seed sown two to four months previously; parsley and mint, endives and lettuce, onions, tomatoes, water-melons flourish, though in some cases with a tendency to degenerate which needs to be corrected by a reversion to European stock.

The production of articles more proper to the climate is stunted by the indolence of man, but by no niggardliness on the part of Nature. Maize, introduced by the Portuguese from the New World, gives two or, under favourable circumstances, three crops a year on the same ground, unsheathing its massy ears one month after the grain has been deposited in the teeming soil. Of Portuguese importation likewise are the coffee-plant and pineapple, which now grow wild over vast districts, and the manioc or cassava, the adopted but chief food of the indigenous population. A less welcome Brazilian immigrant is the tormenting little insect known as the chigoe or 'jigger.' Brought to the coast by an English ship in 1872, it spread with astounding rapidity both laterally and forwards, and is already a familiar pest from Sierra Leone to Mossamedes, from Banana to Bólobó.

The actual exports from the Congo are few in number; but their multiplication, as well as their increase, is a question purely of labour and transport. Even as it is, they are of no small importance, our own share of them being valued at about a million sterling annually. Palm-oil and kernels, serving to make our candles, soap, and glycerine, to grease the wheels of our railway-carriages, and, in the shape of oil-cake, to feed our cattle; ground-nuts, giving a large proportion of the 'olive'-oil of commerce; caoutchouc, drained from the sturdy stem of the flowering, heavy-scented liana entitled *Jandolphia florida*; with, south of the river, some ivory, coffee, beeswax, gum copal, sesamum seeds, and baobab fibres for paper-making, are the chief objects of trade.* Cotton, sugar, tobacco, rice, dye-woods, spices may be added in indefinite quantity, whenever hands to develope,

* Fritz Robert, 'Afrika als Handelsgebiet,' p. 185. The use of the inner bark of the baobab (*Adansonia digitata*) in the manufacture of paper was discovered by the late Mr. Monteiro in 1858. 1,500 tons of this substance are now annually exported from the district between Ambriz and the Congo alone.

and transport to convey, the native riches of the country can be provided.

It must be remembered that the opening of these provinces to legitimate traffic is, as it were, of yesterday. So long as the slave markets of the West remained open, a criminal but lucrative traffic, defiant alike of the provisions of Portuguese law and the vigilance of English cruisers, continued balefully to stifle—with one exception—every other. The exception was the trade in ivory, which was the complement, and is but the languishing survival, of that in slaves. Promise had at one time seemed to be given of a brighter future. The Portuguese missionaries established at San Salvador and in Angola preached the gospel of labour with no less zeal than they preached the gospel of peace, and owed a large part of their success to the less spiritual part of their instructions. They introduced the cultivation of sugar and coffee, taught the people to prepare indigo and to smelt iron; and groups of cocoa-nut and oil-palms, of orange and lemon trees, with the ruins of ancient monasteries, still recall the memory of their beneficent activity.* The power, however, which they thus acquired, rendered them objects of envy; the diversion of Portuguese energy to the more spacious region of the Brazils rendered them victims of neglect. The expulsion of the Jesuits cut off the chief supply of teachers; the pursuit of nefarious gains brought in its train moral apathy, and the paralysis of every higher interest; and the Portuguese dominions in Africa were, until far on in the present century, all but completely surrendered to the disposal of corrupt officials and a slave-dealing plutocracy.

The attempt to catalogue the various riches derivable to commerce from the expanse of territory of which Stanley Pool forms the portal would be idle and tedious:—

‘Quem qui scire velit, Libyci velit æquoris idem
Discere quam multæ zephyro turbentur arenæ.’

Suffice it to say, that the oil-palm—a tree with a great commercial future—grows everywhere in the vast basin of the Congo, up to a height of 2,600 or 2,800 feet above the sea; that ivory, ‘as abundant as fuel,’ met the inquisitive gaze of Stanley in the far interior; that, throughout the broad tracts west of Tanganyika, cotton, coffee, tobacco, nutmegs, pepper, sesamum, india-rubber grow wild; that rice, wheat,

* Angola and the River Congo, vol. i. p. 212, vol. ii. p. 97.

and fruit-trees thrive wherever they have been cultivated; and that the mineral riches hereafter to be explored include iron and copper (probably in enormous quantities), cinnabar and lead, with local deposits (notably in Urua) of the precious metals.*

A more doubtful theme remains to be touched upon—the inevitable one of humanity. Of humanity fallen to abysmal depths of degradation, but still human, and therefore pathetic, problematical, heart-stirring. The first contact of a civilised with a savage race is an event always of deep, and occasionally of tragic, import. So much is promised, and seems possible—a moral resurrection; spiritual regeneration; the unearned inheritance of all the costly stores of hard-won knowledge; the sudden acquisition of powers over nature far transcending previous conception or present understanding. So little is performed. The odious and revolting, yet comparatively innocent, practices of barbarism are exchanged for, or associated with, the deadlier sins of cultured existence; the

‘Hordes grown European-hearted’

arm dishonesty with a shrewder cunning, veneer vice with hypocrisy, inflate ignorance with arrogance; the advent of the Gospel is heralded, and overshadowed, by the unstinted distribution of the fierce provocatives of gin and gunpowder. Yet our higher life, with its ‘knowledge of good and evil,’ must, by the working of a law which we cannot presume to dispute, and can hardly affect to control, be presented to them; and in the twilight of their gross and besotted souls the tremendous choice must be made.

The whole of Southern Africa, from five or six degrees north of the Line to the Cape of Good Hope, is inhabited by a single variety of the human species, designated as the Bantu stock. They are believed to have come from the north-east, and to have displaced aboriginal inhabitants, of whom representatives survive in Hottentots and Bushmen, and perhaps in some dwarfish tribes of the interior. Of a higher type than, though closely related to, the negro race, the Bantu peoples have, in many parts of the continent, brought to a high pitch the arts needed for the supply of their rude wants, while those wants themselves show no traces—we had almost said, no possibility—of being touched with any finer feeling. Amongst them there unquestionably exist cannibal tribes, although the practice has not been

* Keith Johnston, ‘Africa,’ p. 353.

brought home with certainty to any of the dwellers in the valley of the Congo. All these latter are keen traders and rigid monopolists; and to Stanley's unwitting contravention of the iron customs blocking the navigation of the great river, the unrelenting hostility everywhere encountered by him on his first voyage was probably due, rather than to the mere loathsome greed of human flesh. In a similar spirit, the coast tribes have immemorially arrogated to themselves the privileges and profits of intermediaries between European traders and their customers from the interior, clinging to both with a tenacity which effectually barred access to the country behind. These mischievous monopolies, however, have now at last been submerged by the great wave of progress carrying the enterprise, the curiosity, and the philanthropy of Europe to the centre of Africa.

The inhabitants of the districts below Stanley Pool may all be comprised under the appellation of 'Bakongo,' or 'people of Kongo.' Once united to form the imposing kingdom of that name discovered by the Portuguese in the fifteenth century, they have since lost all trace of national cohesion, and there is reason to believe that civil disintegration has been accompanied by social, if not by moral, degeneracy. They prove to be, in general, an inoffensive, though scarcely a very estimable, race. Morality they have none; in lying, stealing, and cheating they are 'to the manner born;' their memory for benefits is fleeting; their laziness is unconquerable and incurable. Yet they are not devoid of kindly impulses, and glimpses of, and desires for, better things. These, however, are embedded in the mud of gross and cruel superstitions, by which the vague aspirations towards the unknown implanted in every human breast are turned into the fatal instruments of further degradation. The ignoble parody of religion which they profess is fetichism in its vilest form; sorcery gives the only admitted *rationale* of disastrous occurrences, and reaps a plentiful harvest of victims; each death is investigated or revenged by the witch-detecting draught of 'casca,' the Bakongo philosophy of life including no idea of its natural limitation. The *nganga*, or 'fetish-man,' raised to that 'bad eminence' by superior intelligence or villainy, represents justice, exorcises the demons of sickness, guides the fury, or imposes the tyranny of superstition, and reaps the wages of power.

Circumcision is universally practised on boys approaching the age of manhood, and is in many places associated with a prolonged course of initiation, including the acquisition

of a hieratic language, never communicated to females or strangers. The Bakongo week consists of four days; the year of six months; each dry and each rainy season being reckoned as a distinct term. Their ideas of time, however, are extremely vague; they have scarcely the faintest national, and probably a very feeble personal, consciousness of the past, and only the most confused and evanescent anticipations of a future state.

A more wholly dissipated and worthless life than that of these unsophisticated people it would be difficult to conceive. Dancing, drinking of *malafù* (the fermented juice of the palm or sugar-cane), with clamorous enjoyment protracted far into the night, are succeeded by the characteristic matutinal ill-humour of the rake, soothed by tobacco, or vented in conjugal squabbles. The slight tillage of the ground needed to raise enough beans, manioc, plantains, and sweet potatoes to live upon, with a stock of ground-nuts to barter for rum and muskets, is accomplished by the women; the men, fully conscious of the dignity of their sex, yawn and smoke, hunt—with or without the aid of mangy curs not even civilised enough to yelp—such small game as rats and lemurs, field-mice, frogs, and grasshoppers, snare birds, or draw from their nets the abundant and delicious fish with which the rivers are stored. Their ample leisure renders them, as might be expected, prodigal of time. ‘Palavers’ with them are intolerably tedious; procrastination is their chosen ally; the white man’s fever of haste is met by the stolid resistance of inertia. Yet the commodity they squander is even more scantily at their disposal than it is at ours; their lives are short, and old age overtakes them in what to a European would be the prime of life.

The Bateke and Bayansi tribes, encountered at and above Stanley Pool, present a wilder and stranger, if less sordid, aspect than the population of the littoral and intermediate territory. Their bodies are stained with camwood, ochre, and charcoal, or decorated with cicatrices raised into fanciful patterns; their faces are hideously distinguished by deep tribal cuts; the merciless extirpation of eyebrows and eyelashes is æsthetically supplied for by glaring circles of red and yellow paint; their exuberant hair stands erect in a multitude of porcupine-quill plaits, or rises in hornlike, or depends in proboscidal, excrescences, or, in those of simpler tastes, is severely straitened into a pigtail; their scanty clothing is of native grass-cloth, dyed deep red with camwood. Yet the lighter tinge of their chocolate-brown com-

plexions, as well as the nobler cast of their physiognomies, attests a higher type of humanity than that of the Bakongo, who, it is conjectured, have adulterated the purity of their Bantu descent by admixture with the lower races they drove before them towards the sea. Indeed, the villages on the Upper Congo can occasionally show specimens of the perfectly developed human form recalling the beauty of a Greek statue.* Moreover, the arts of life are cultivated with increased diligence and success. The houses† (constructed, as usual, of palm-fronds or dried grass woven over a framework of light poles) are spacious and well-built; weapons and utensils show no common skill in the finish; an air of comfort and prosperity surrounds these plantain-shaded dwellings. A more vital improvement is the relaxation of the tyranny, and disappearance of the chief terrors of fetichism and witchcraft, accompanied with the retention in a more distinct though still shadowy form of the idea of a Supreme Being.

Mr. Stanley has, by a rough and perhaps over-sanguine process of calculation, arrived at the figure of 49,000,000 as representing the inhabitants of the Congo basin; M. de Brazza raises the estimate to 80,000,000. It is not unlikely that even the lower one exceeds the truth, though not so far that we may not with prudence accept it, at least provisionally. Now, stripping off philanthropic disguises (since altruistic considerations appeal, and will perhaps always continue to appeal, to a small minority), we may say, baldly and bluntly, that the desire to secure the custom of these fifty millions of savages is the motive power chiefly impelling European action in the valley of the Congo. Other markets are already glutted, or blocked by exclusive tariffs; yet production must go on, for production is a law of life to the manufacturing populations of the world. Hence the eager search and struggle for new outlets to relieve the growing pressure of over-production, and set the stagnant waters of trade flowing.

Thus we want these people far more directly and consciously than they want us. We want them to buy our cottons, our cutlery, our hardware, and, alas! our more pernicious commodities as well. We want them to develope

* Johnston, 'The River Congo,' p. 210. His pencil, it must be said, is less flattering than his pen.

† This does not apply to the Bateke huts on the shores of Stanley Pool, which are low and ill-built.

the riches of *their* country for *our* benefit—to plant, to delve, to mine, in order that the industries of Europe may be quickened, and the luxuries of Europe augmented by the inpouring of the tropical bounties of Africa. The coldest views of self-interest, then, demand that we should come amongst them as peacemakers and protectors. Their elevation is our advantage, still more their preservation. We must educate them to feel wants we alone can supply; we must abate their barbarian pride, and subdue their barbarian indolence, to embrace the restraints, because appreciating the rewards, of industrial occupations. Above all, we must at all hazards avert from them the impending curse of the slave trade. Already a lair of human beasts of prey is fixed at Nyangwe on the higher Congo; it may not be easy to dislodge or extirpate, but it ought to be possible to limit them to their actual field of ravage. Recent events in the Soudan have, indeed, gravely added to the difficulty of realising even this moderate pretension; for it should be remembered that the cause of the False Prophet and his triumph are the cause and the triumph of the slave-hunters of Equatorial Africa. It may, however, be hoped that the organisation of the Belgian Association will offer an impassable barrier to their progress westward, although without resorting to so extreme a remedy as that on the point of being applied by General Gordon previous to his unfortunate mission to Khartoum—that of raising an ‘ever-victorious army’ of liberated slaves to protect the harassed districts, and thus braving the dangers of a servile war in order to avert the horrors of slave-razzias.

It now becomes of interest to consider the progress actually made in opening up these magnificent regions. And here the International Association has distanced all competitors. Not so much to the priority secured by prompt action is this due, as to the judgement displayed in employing as chief agent Henry Morton Stanley.

The early history of this remarkable man is no secret, and does him uncommon credit. From the first, we discern in him that ineradicable tendency to rise to the summit of circumstance, which has conducted him from a position of, it might have seemed, hopeless obscurity, to one of splendid power and reputation. In the poor-house of St. Asaph he scraped together learning enough to qualify him, at the age of thirteen, for the post of school teacher.* Reaching New

* *Men of the Time*, 11th ed. 1884.

Orleans two years later, in the modest capacity of a cabin-boy, he attracted the notice of a merchant, whose adoption he emphasised by the exchange of his native name of Rowlands for that now borne by him. He was not destined, however, for the enjoyment of an adventitious prosperity. Thrown once more upon his own resources by the unexpected death of his patron, he adopted the military profession, and, at the close of the Civil War, drifted into no less congenial employment as a newspaper correspondent. His first visit to Africa was in 1867, when he attended, as the representative of the 'New York Herald,' the march of the British army to Magdala. How he 'found Livingstone,' and how he crossed 'the Dark Continent,' we have no need to recall to the memory of our readers.

In August, 1879, he reached the mouth of the Congo, prepared to lay formal siege to its defences. To one of fewer resources they might well have appeared impregnable. The first 'civilising station' was planted at Vivi, where the river ceases to be navigable. Thence to Isangila, a distance of fifty-two miles, a road had to be constructed, along which to transport the sectional steamers destined for the exploration of the immense aqueous tracks above. The obstacles were enormous, and cost sixteen months of unremitting toil to overcome. For the first time, the natives of the Congo witnessed the triumphs of engineering skill; and their admiration is concentrated and commemorated in Stanley's local title of the 'Rock-breaker' (*Bulu-mutale*). A second station was established at Isangila; and it was there found possible to trust, for some seventy-three miles, to the ready-made, but rude and treacherous, water-path for the transport of the expeditionary material. By the end of May 1881, the whole pioneering force was collected at a third station near the native market of Manyanga, whence Stanley Pool—the goal of so many endeavours—lay in a remoteness of about ninety-five miles. Some delays, caused by sickness and negotiations, interposed before Stanley was able to realise his project of pushing on in front to survey and secure building ground, and establish friendly relations. It was thus the end of July before he reached the vital spot. He had the mortification to find that he had been anticipated.

Count Pietro Savorgnan de Brazza was born at Rome, of an ancient and noble Friulian family, in 1852. Some daring exploits in a leaky boat on the Lake of Albano indicated, it is thought, his adventurous turn, and having removed to France, he, in 1868, entered the naval school at Brest, and

left it with the rank of midshipman after two years. In 1872 he found himself stationed in the 'Vénus,' at the mouth of the Gaboon. The French colony here seated 'astride of the equator,' was occupied in 1842, and extended in 1862 so as to include the spacious delta of the Ogowe, covering, on both sides of Cape Lopes, a sea-front of eighty miles. Only the lower course of the united river was known; but the great breadth of its channel, and the considerable body of water traversing it at all seasons, intimated a distant origin and an imposing career. De Brazza fell under the spell of indefinite possibility exercised by the great African rivers. The idea took possession of him that the Ogowe would prove to be one of Nature's highways to, or across, the mysterious equatorial plateau, and might even serve as the outlet for the perplexing flood of the Lualaba. Properly authorised and tolerably equipped, he started from the Gaboon for its exploration November 2, 1875. Three years later he returned, crestfallen. The Ogowe had turned out to be a mere littoral stream, of no commanding geographical or commercial importance. His journey, however, had not been void of some notable positive results, besides this negative one. Abandoning the blind-alley of the Ogowe, he struck towards the interior, across a bare and sandy waste, to which the recent tracks of lions lent some of the dignity of dread, and came upon two considerable rivers—the Alima and the Licona—flowing nearly due east. From the navigation of the former the murderous assaults of the riparian population compelled him to desist, after he had descended it in canoes for upwards of 100 kilometres. He was then, unknown to himself, within five days' sail of the Congo.

Scarcely had he heard the result of Stanley's *experimentum crucis* as to the Lualaba, when he perceived that both his newly-discovered rivers must belong to the Congo system, and would, perhaps, afford means of communication with its upper waters, less direct, but more practicable, than the audacious way of the thirty-two cataracts. Above all, the route of the Ogowe would be a French route, and swift advantage might be taken of it to secure the priority of French interests in the opening Eldorado of the future. De Brazza, after his manner, spared no pains to render *actual* what he saw to be *possible*, and left Europe on a fresh African mission, December 27, 1879. On September 10, 1880, he concluded, with the 'Makoko,' or king of the Batekes, the famous treaty ratified by the French Chamber, November 21, 1882.

Now, it is a question whether this potentate is *the* Makoko, or merely *a* Makoko. The title signifies 'lord,' or 'prince;' is an appellative, not an appellation; and as such is, or may be, borne by the chiefs of many different tribes. But in the descriptions of early topographers, one pre-eminent, though uncertainly posited, 'Macoco' figures, celebrated by Dapper as the ruler of thirteen kingdoms. Of this 'geographical Proteus' (to borrow Captain Burton's phrase) De Brazza claims that his African ally is the legitimate successor. We apprehend that the title would be difficult to establish; but let that pass. Time could scarcely be more arrantly wasted than in argument over the hereditary rights of negroid kinglets.

The practical upshot, at any rate, of De Brazza's dealings with him was the establishment of the French, in a position of privilege and precedence, on the shores of Stanley Pool. A strip of land, situated on the right bank, close to its southern entrance, became the site (October 3, 1880) of the station since named 'Brazzaville;' the local chiefs hoisted the tricolor in token of their adoption of French interests, and choice of French protection; and the prize striven for was, to all appearance, won.

But Stanley actually commanded the 'resources of civilisation' which De Brazza's flags and parchments only symbolised. A preliminary repulse, due to the strong Gallican prepossessions of the tribes, served only to quicken his resolution. He pushed on the completion of his road from Manyanga, pacified and won over the chiefs, founded Leopoldville (the 'great Empire City'—that is to be—of Central Africa, in Mr. Johnston's glowing anticipation), and launched, December 3, 1881, the first steamer by which the tranquil surface of Stanley Pool was furrowed.

The position of Leopoldville was the best that could be obtained, but is scarcely everything that could be desired. The substantial and commodious buildings which shelter the *personnel* and supplies of the Belgian Expedition, are placed at an elevation of 50 feet above the river, just two miles below its emergence from the Pool. They lie opposite to, but further down than Brazzaville, which has its seat at the very mouth of the outrushing torrent, while the rival settlement is pushed, as it were, somewhat down the throat of the ravine affording it an exit. The tribulations of the rapids have, indeed, by anticipation there already set in; and its access to the Pool is accordingly neither safe nor easy.

Both leaders repaired to Europe in the autumn of 1882, to report progress and recruit health. It would be difficult to exaggerate the qualities brought by each to the fulfilment of his task: celerity, endurance, adamantine resolution, unflinching courage; the power to disarm, and the patience to suffer, barbarian opposition; skill to evade, intrepidity to confront, prudence to retire before, difficulties. Equally remote from both is the character of a mere vulgar adventurer. De Brazza is an enthusiast, who has spent a large part of his private fortune in carrying out an idea by which he has been pursued almost from boyhood; his humanity and tenderness towards the lower races with whom he has been brought into contact have earned him the title of 'Father of Slaves;' only his patriotism towards his adopted country may, to insular spectators, appear to savour overmuch of that chauvinism which, forcibly repressed in Europe, seeks to recuperate and vent its energies in distant adventure. Stanley, on his side, sees and seeks in the mighty river of which he may justly be styled the discoverer, the redemption of the 'lost continent,' and works for the future both of Europe and Africa. Nor should it be forgotten that the personal rivalry, which has at times strained the relations of these two striking individuals, has never been permitted to transgress the limits prescribed by loyalty to a common purpose, or to exclude mutual aid in the vicissitudes of their alternating fortunes.

The visit to headquarters in 1882 marked the close of one and the opening of a fresh struggle for priority. De Brazza had won the race to Stanley Pool. A new goal was now before him. Returning to the coast in March 1882, he had discovered a hitherto untried route, of which he was not slow to discern the advantages. A fine river, some 1,200 feet wide, enters the Atlantic about 110 miles north of the Congo. It is there known as the Kuilu, though higher up it is designated the Niari. De Brazza's mobile mind at once grasped the idea of its importance to his position at Stanley Pool. A short road or railway connecting its navigable waters with those of the Jué, which enter the Pool hard by Brazzaville, would, he perceived, bring the French station within 280 miles of the sea, whereas its line of communication by means of the Alima and Ogowe is reckoned to measure 500.

Not without the expenditure of much eloquence and energy the French Chamber was induced to provide the cost of a fresh expedition, destined, primarily, for the occupation

of the Kuilu valley. But it was now Stanley's turn to play the forestaller—to

‘Seize the arrow's barb
Before the tense string murmur.’

While he was still generally supposed to be enjoying well-earned repose at Nice or Madrid, he was already on the coast of Africa; and De Brazza learned, by severe experience, that preparations often prove abortive for the precise reason that they have been clamorous. His ships reached the mouth of the Kuilu only to find it in full Belgian occupation, and he had reluctantly to content himself with the seizure of the two not unimportant coast settlements of Loango and Ponta Nera.

Since the execution of the *coup de main* in the Kuilu valley the progress of the Belgian Association has, in little more than a year, been rapid and splendid. By the latest reports (doubtless already behind the truth) the blue flag with a golden star, chosen to symbolise an anomalous though imposing authority, is displayed at thirty-odd stations; close upon two thousand persons are in the employment of its agents; the territory ceded to it is measured by degrees of latitude; a flotilla of thirteen vessels keeps up communications along the ‘moving highway’ of the great river. For 2,000 miles and upwards from its mouth, the populations of its shores have been startled by the portent of steam-navigation, and their opposition to the white man's progress at least temporarily cowed. Even the great Aruwimi—to Stanley of formidable memory—has been successfully ascended, although its attempted and desirable identification with the Welle of Schweinfurth, by which the systems of the Nile and Congo would be brought into close connexion, and a water route opened into the heart of the Ghazal country, must, in the face of Dr. Junker's adverse conclusion, be still regarded as doubtful. Close to Stanley Falls, a series of seven cataracts by which navigation is interrupted 270 miles below Nyangwe, the furthest station (so far) on the Congo was founded in December last; and tentative intercourse was held with Karema, on Lake Tanganyika. Thus the colossal programme of 1876 is well within view of realisation, and the girdle of civilised communication, by which the unknown continent was then designed to be spanned, is being rounded off to completion.

But these surprising results have not been obtained without a notable change in the character of the organisation

effecting them. As an 'international' concern it may be said to have utterly broken down. The 'note' of universality has long ago departed from it. The formation of national committees, acting under the guidance of the Belgian Executive, was part of its original constitution, and representatives from no less than ten European countries met in a species of international parliament at Brussels, to discuss and concert measures, June 20, 1877. The promise of harmonious action, however, thus held out has not been maintained. Secession, virtual or avowed, has been the order of the day; and the parent institution finds itself surrounded by, while separated from, a number of independent bodies, pursuing, in a less sublime spirit, similar designs. The German committee was promptly transformed into the 'Deutsche afrikanische Gesellschaft,' under whose auspices the explorations of Schütt and Buchner, Pogge and Wissmann have been carried out; the Dutch committee rebelled on a suspicion of partiality to Belgian commerce; the Lisbon Geographical Society has absorbed and exalted the functions of a national committee in an extensive plan for spreading civilising influences throughout Portuguese Equatorial Africa; the French committee has been submerged by, rather than identified with, the overwhelming activity of De Brazza; by the 'African Exploration Fund,' organised in the bosom of the Royal Geographical Society, the English committee was superseded before it came into existence—on all sides separatist influences or particular interests have gained the upper hand.

Nor have the pacific professions of the Association been quite satisfactorily borne out. From Lake Tanganyika news comes of a formal, if miniature, war of offence and chastisement, and on the Congo likewise rough work has undoubtedly been going on, although details are carefully withheld. Now it may be urged that in dealing with savage tribes kid gloves must occasionally be discarded, and that the exigencies of self-defence are imperative. Granted; but they are also seductive and indefinite, continually and easily leading on to oppression.

Again, the humanitarian question has been raised. Indeed, the accusation of slaveholding is freely bandied in Africa between rival pretenders to disinterestedness and enlightenment. Moreover, the system of labour by contract, which the Association has in some cases been compelled to adopt, is one peculiarly liable to abuse. Yet since it is admitted to be legitimate, and cannot be denied to be, if jealously

guarded, in the main beneficial, we should hesitate, on meagre or doubtful reports, to let loose our virtuous indignation.

An unquestionable fact, however, and one of especial significance to ourselves, is the political importance assumed by a private and irresponsible society. And here we desire to say, once for all, that in pointing out the changes undergone by its purposes and modes of procedure, we throw no aspersion on the sincerity of its founders. Their projects have only become modified by hard contact with facts—a frequent experience. The Association imagined at Brussels was an ideal creation; the Association we see at work in Africa is its concrete embodiment. The difference is great, but was perhaps inevitable. The force of circumstances, the pressure of interests, have acted, as they too often act, irresistibly. The transformation we are considering is a development, not a discovery. No mask has been removed, but inborn tendencies have worked themselves to the surface.

We see, then, before us, not now a mere civilising and scientific body, but a power, albeit a highly nondescript one, playing an important part in the politics of the world. Its possessions, whether actual or prospective, are vast enough to suggest a scheme for their consolidation into a Federal Union of Central African Free States; the provinces of the Kuilu-Niari district alone, recently entrusted to the administration of Captain Grant Elliott, are said to equal England in extent, and the flag of the Association now flies along an unbroken coast-line of 300 miles. The provisions of certain treaties with native chiefs, of which the latest instalment of parliamentary papers relating to Africa includes a transcript, show these prodigious territories to have been acquired, in full sovereignty, for purely nominal considerations; while the prompt acceptance encountered by General Gordon's remarkable offer of handing over to the Association two spacious provinces out of the wreck of the Egyptian Soudan, suggests that its 'land-hunger' is still far from being appeased.

Over the whole of the huge but indefinite region which, in the audacity of its sudden *prestige*, it has been emboldened to acquire, the Belgian Association claims to exercise the rights not only of sovereign sway, but of private property. It claims to legislate, to administer, to levy tolls and taxes at discretion, to conclude alliances, to enlist armed auxiliaries; it claims no less the sole privilege of developing, for its own advantage, the natural riches of the country, of cultivating

waste lands, of fishing, mining, felling timber, gathering caoutchouc, copal, wax, and honey. Its agents, no longer the disinterested pioneers of universal commerce, are themselves traders as well as rulers, and traders of the most exclusive type.* It is true that the Association is prepared to barter the monopolies to which it pretends for the official recognition of its status as a sovereign power; and the condition has recently been accepted by the United States. But other civilised nations may well hesitate to admit to their equality an organisation without a responsible head, subject to none of the restraints holding established communities in check, secret in its operations, intangible in its representatives, evanescent, it may be, in its brilliant flare of prosperity. Its financial position is stated by its partisans to be one of overflowing prosperity. But its outgoings have been enormous, its incomings (apart from trade profits as yet necessarily restricted) depend upon private liberality, and private, even if royal, liberality has limits. Failure of resources involves abdication of power, and we are already invited to contemplate, as a not remote contingency, the sale by international auction of privileges and immunities acquired in the name of humanity, and even now proffered as a bid for empire. It is to be hoped that such an ignominious collapse will be averted of a body whose very professions have raised the standard of endeavour, and whose initiative has opened to Africa a door of escape from the degradation of ages.

The history of the Belgian Association shows this clearly, if it shows nothing else—that native rule on the Congo is passing away. At the cost of a few dozens of rum, and a few gross of red cotton nightcaps, it may at any moment be superseded, on treaty terms, by a more uncompromising sway. Before it is too late, then, it behoves us, as a great commercial power, to look to our interests there, and supply them, in the wise prevision of menacing eventualities, with a just and necessary safeguard. This the treaty recently negotiated between Great Britain and Portugal aimed at, and we retain the opinion that this arrangement was a fair and judicious one. But to give effect to it the assent of the other Powers interested in the trade of the African coast was necessary, and as that assent has not been given, the treaty is consequently defunct unless its provisions can be revived in the form of an international compact. Some

* See the articles of the treaties above referred to. Papers pres. to Parl. Africa, No. 5 (1884), pp. 1-4.

such agreement the present state of affairs on the Congo seems to render indispensably necessary.

The case stands thus. The sovereignty of Portugal on the West Coast of Africa extends, *de facto*, from the eighth to the eighteenth parallel of south latitude—from the port of Ambriz, that is to say, to Cape Frio; but she asserts, and has for ages asserted, her right to the territory lying north of Ambriz, as far as $5^{\circ} 12'$ below the line. In this region the mouth of the Congo is included. The historical basis of the claim is fully set forth in two pamphlets by the Viscount de Sa da Bandeira* and the Viscount de Santarem† respectively. We need here do no more than recall the circumstances that it was recognised by France in 1786, permitted to be 'reserved' by England in treaties concluded in 1810, 1815, and 1817; while the constitutional charter of 1838, in which the doubtful territories were described as forming part of the Portuguese monarchy, met with no protest from any quarter.

But in 1846 the policy of this country on the subject underwent a change. Passive admission of the dormant rights of Portugal was replaced by categorical denial, accompanied by the threat and intention of forcibly resisting any attempt to make those rights effective by occupation. The exigencies of the campaign against the slave trade, together with the importance of preserving free commercial relations with the disputed district, explained and justified an attitude in appearance overbearing. But while the local annihilation of slave traffic has rendered the one set of precautions obsolete, the increasing liberality of Portuguese policy has rendered it feasible to enforce the other by means less arbitrary. This might suffice to justify the withdrawal of our veto upon a legitimate assertion of ancient rights; but this is not all.

The state of things in the region of the Lower Congo is intolerable, and daily tends to become worse. All the evils attending the absence of settled government are rife there: oppression, bloodshed, confusion, insecurity; private violence

* Facts and Statements concerning the Right of the Crown of Portugal to Territories on the West Coast of Africa.

† A Statement of Facts proving the Right of the Crown of Portugal to the Territories situated on the Western Coast of Africa, lying between the fifth degree and twelve minutes, and the eighth degree of south latitude. Both these valuable repertories of historical facts were translated into English in 1877.

takes the place of public justice; outrages, and reprisals for outrages, alternate with dismal and shocking regularity. Moreover, by the throng and hurry of growing competition, anarchy is so aggravated as to become a peril, from having been a disgrace, to the civilised world.

The country is nominally ruled by a swarm of petty chieftains, the pensioners and parasites of the foreign trading establishments, whom the white man cajoles while he is weak, and defies when he is strong. Savage customs form the only law; redress is vainly sought in 'palavers,' but very effectually found in massacre and conflagration. Within the last few months the details of no less than three affrays between natives and Europeans have been communicated to the Foreign Office, each of which was sufficiently serious to require the presence on the spot of a Portuguese ship of war. In one of these disturbances, about forty natives were killed in an attack upon a Dutch factory, the town of Muculla and four villages were completely destroyed, and the adjacent fields of maize and manioc wasted.* The *little war* of Noki in February last—a wantonly aggressive one on the European side—was marked by similar incidents; and minor hostilities doubtless remain unrecorded for lack of reporters.

It is, moreover, notorious that the work of the factories is mainly carried on by what is, to all intents and purposes, slave-labour. 'The so-called 'kroomen' are sold into bondage by their 'kings.' Of their choice in the matter there is no question; willingly or unwillingly they are conveyed, and willingly or unwillingly detained; if they attempt to escape they are recaptured, and flogged or fettered. Gangs of these miserable creatures may be seen at work, chained together, in the precincts of European establishments at Banana; a common ignominy indistinguishably confounding criminals and runaways.

Nor is this the worst. The traders of the Congo are at once destitute of the protection of law, and in the possession of irresponsible power; and of irresponsible power crime is the concomitant. In the treatment of slaves humanity is the rule; but, under circumstances continually liable to arise, atrocity forms an admitted and approved exception. No longer ago than 1877 about thirty persons—men and women, with boys and girls of tender age—were drowned in cold blood, on suspicion of having been implicated in an attempt

* Papers presented to Parliament. Africa, No. 5 (1884), Nos. 2, 4, and 6.

to set fire to a factory at Ponta da Lenha. And the evidence on which they were thus murdered—for they were mocked with no form of trial—was wrenched from unwilling or unknowing witnesses by the excruciating torture and unsparing use of the thumb-screw. Yet the ‘public opinion’ of the European community entirely approved these horrible acts, as necessary, by inspiring a wholesome terror, to secure the safety of property. Their perpetrators are still at large.

‘There is no doubt,’ the British Consul at Loanda (Mr. David Hopkins) wrote to Lord Derby on this occasion, ‘that all the houses in the Congo, and all along the coast from Ambriz to Black Point, and further north still, hold slaves more or less.’ [Elsewhere he excepts the English firms, and testifies to the humanity of the Dutch.] ‘They cannot export them, as there is no market; but they would not hesitate to do so in a moment, if they saw an opportunity. These unfortunate people are helpless in their hands, and are sacrificed daily at the whim or caprice of their cruel, brutal masters. Commodore Sir William Hewett and myself have seen women working in chains up to their middles in water at —’s factory . . . — and — have been murdering their slaves for years (death seems to be the only punishment), and I can assure your Lordship that some of the means adopted by white men to put people to death are too horrible to be written down. All the white men in the tract of country lying between the northern boundary of Angola and the southern boundary of Gaboon consider there is no law, they are not responsible to any government for their actions, and they do just what they please.’ (Africa, No. 2 (1883), No. 47.)

The last sentence explains some part of the outcry against the contemplated arrangement for establishing regular government in these regions. Anarchy has its attractions. Setting aside the *freedom of crime* afforded by a ‘no man’s land,’ which many, not by nature or intention miscreants, inevitably take advantage of, it presents opportunities for independent enterprise and vigorous action necessarily limited by the salutary shackles of settled life. Each factory on the Congo forms, it might be said, a little kingdom complete within itself. It acknowledges responsibility to no external authority; it makes its own terms with the surrounding populations, exercises an absolute jurisdiction over its dependents, recognises the dangerous duties, and claims the elastic rights, of self-defence. The smaller establishments have thus, by a process of ‘natural selection,’ been, to a great extent, eliminated; those with larger resources have prevailed. It is not surprising that they should cling to privileges which have, in some cases, been legitimately

acquired and temperately exercised, but which are, in all cases, subject to deplorable abuse.

Admitting then, as all dispassionate enquirers must admit, that a change is necessary, the question as to the nature of that change presses for an immediate answer. There is no time to be lost; events may at any moment anticipate and render nugatory our decision. From what has been stated it is obvious that the claims of Portugal are too strong to be justly set aside unless from motives of stringent necessity. Do such motives exist? The Anti-Slavery Society has entered a protest against the extension of Portuguese authority on the ground of its alleged connivance with, or toleration of, the oppressors of negro humanity. We will leave it to the British Minister at Lisbon to refute this grave charge, re-echoed in various quarters.

'I am convinced,' Mr. Petre wrote to Lord Granville on April 13, 1884, 'that the Government of this country is as sincere and firm in its determination to aid in the suppression of the slave trade as any other European Government, and would be as little disposed to tolerate any prostitution of its authority for such a purpose. Mistrust, and suspicion of Portuguese tolerance with respect to the slave trade, are legacies of the past. In these days of rapid intercommunication the arm of the metropolitan government is far-reaching enough to make its power felt and its will respected; nor, taking the lowest ground, is it likely that colonial officials would run the risk involved in winking at the iniquitous traffic, without a prospect, or, even more a certainty, of personal gain. Yet it is notorious that, as a rule, Portuguese colonial governors return home, after their few years' tenure of office, as poor as they went.' (Africa, No. 5 (1884), No. 36.).

Still more frequent, and not less earnest, are the reclamations on behalf of commercial freedom. Most of these can be met by a simple recital of the provisions of the treaty signed on February 26 last, which are the best justification of the measure. They are summarised by Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, in replying, March 21, 1884, to the objections of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, as follows :—

'The navigation, police, and general control of the River Congo are placed under a Mixed Commission,* thereby extending for the first time the principles of the Treaty of Vienna, in regard to freedom of navigation, to a river in Africa. It is evident that, as civilisation extends into the interior of that continent, the principle of the freedom

* It is probable that Lord Granville's original proposal of an International Commission will be reverted to.

of the navigation of the Congo will accompany it, now that that principle has been established as a matter of international concern.

'In the specified territory Great Britain obtains absolute most-favoured-nation treatment, and also equal treatment with Portuguese traders, so that all differential treatment, whether in favour of Portuguese ships or goods, or those of any other nation, is impossible. The coasting trade is also thrown open to the British flag, and in all the African possessions of Portugal the present customs tariff is not to be raised for a period of ten years. This arrangement secures the retention of the 6 per cent. *ad valorem* tariff at Ambriz, which, though technically within the limits of the specified territory, has been for many years an undisputed Portuguese possession, and is therefore not within the description of the preamble of the treaty.

'In the territory itself the customs tariff is not to exceed the rates of the Mozambique tariff of 1877. The maximum rates under that tariff in regard to the principal articles of British trade are as follows : 6 per cent. *ad valorem* on iron ; 10 per cent. *ad valorem* on woollens, linens, and silk, and on mixed tissues ; 10 per cent. *ad valorem* on certain classes of cotton goods, such as cotton velvets, plushes, quiltings, flannels, and blankets ; and specific duties, calculated not to exceed the equivalent of 10 per cent. *ad valorem*, on certain other classes of cotton textures. It is believed in regard to these last that the calculations made in 1877 will have to be revised, as it appears that, owing to the exceedingly cheap character of some of the cotton textures sent into the Congo district, and the recent fall in prices, the specific rates in some cases now represent more than the equivalent of 10 per cent. This is a point which has not escaped the attention of the Foreign Office. Transit by water is to be absolutely free, with proper facilities for bonding and transhipment ; and an assurance has been obtained from the Portuguese Government, that, as soon as roads and railways exist, and proper arrangements can be made, a similar freedom will be accorded to transit by land, subject, of course, to the usual securities against fraud and smuggling.

'Speaking generally, the treaty has been entered into in order to establish security and peace on the Congo ; to put an end to crimes and hindrances to trade, which papers laid before Parliament show to exist in consequence of the absence of any regular government ; to secure moderate customs duties and the prevention of differential imposts ; and to obtain national and complete most-favoured-nation treatment for British subjects, commerce, and shipping. The treaty also contains valuable stipulations in regard to the abolition of slavery and of the slave trade both on the eastern and western coasts of Africa, and for the maintenance of religious liberty.' (*Africa*, No. 5 (1884), No. 22.)

British trade with the Portuguese possessions on the West Coast of Africa has increased of late much more rapidly than with those parts under native rule ;* while the ameliorated

* This has been pointed out by Mr. Joseph C. Lee, of Manchester,

condition of the black population of Angola, the tranquillity of their lives, and the variety and comparative persistence of their industry, give hope of beneficial results on the side of humanity. It has sometimes been asserted that Portuguese interests on the Congo are relatively insignificant; but we find it stated, on unquestioned authority, that of forty-nine factories existing on its banks in 1882, twenty-six were Portuguese, twelve Dutch, seven French, and but four English.* Moreover, Portuguese is the current medium of communication all along that coast; the one language with which a traveller is obliged to be conversant for the purposes of daily intercourse both with Europeans and natives.†

By the stipulations of the treaty with Portugal, the Lower Congo acquired the character of an international highway; but has that highway all the importance attributed to it? We doubt it. About 100 miles from the coast, on the left bank of the river, lies Noki, the furthest point of the contemplated Portuguese dominion; opposite to it is Ikongola, specially reserved to the Belgian Association as the most convenient landing-place for Vivi, whirlpools caused by the agitated and unequal rush of water rendering it frequently unsafe to proceed higher up. Here begins Stanley's road—or, as M. de Brazza prefers to call it, his 'staircase of 300 kilomètres'—offering access to the Pool, in part by means of a precipitous track (we apprehend that only short sections deserve the name of a *road*), in part by means of emphatically 'touch-and-go' navigation in small steamers. The time consumed in thus reaching Leopoldville from Banana is twenty days, whereas the distance can be performed on foot in twenty-three. It is plain that the remunerative transport of goods demands greater facilities than are here afforded. A railway has been spoken of; but,

and is confirmed by a reference to the most authentic statistics of trade.

* Robert, 'Afrika als Handelsgebiet,' p. 48. The original authority is Ribeiro in 'Boletim da Sociedade de Geographia de Lisboa,' 1882, iii. The qualifying statement should be added, that the Portuguese are mostly individual traders, while the English, Dutch, and French establishments represent, in general, large companies.

† It gives a high idea of the intelligence of these people to learn that thousands of the inhabitants of Angola, as far as 200 miles inland, and some even at San Salvador, read and write Portuguese very fairly, although the last of the old missionaries died a century ago (their graves are still reverently tended), and they have since then had next to no European teaching.

while it would be rash to assert that its construction is impossible, it is perfectly certain that it would be enormously costly. Besides, more plausible schemes are already on foot.

The native trade routes leave the Congo at Stanley Pool, and, diverging on either side, strike the coast at considerable distances north and south of its estuary. It is probable that the main arteries of future European communication with the interior will follow the same general directions. The Kuilu valley, as has been mentioned, is now the property of the Congo Association; the possibilities of conducting a railway along it have been, with promising results, explored, and may shortly be brought to the test of realisation. This line, of less than 300 miles, would reach the coast somewhere between Landana and Loango, and would, accordingly, be *entirely outside* the Portuguese dominions. It would, indeed, effectually turn the position of which the Lower Congo forms the direct approach.

South of the Congo, on the other hand, a railway following the track of the ivory caravans from the shores of Stanley Pool through San Salvador to Ambrizette, would chiefly traverse Portuguese territory, and would in all likelihood encounter fewer engineering difficulties than the northern approach. It is to be hoped that the momentous promise of this work will not be blighted through lack of enterprise. The countrymen of João II. and of Vasco de Gama are no longer insensible to the duty of developing the resources of their colonies. In West Africa especially, a new and beneficent activity prevails. The establishment of steam communication with the River Quanza has done much for the prosperity of Loanda, the projected railway to Ambaca will do more. But of far more vital importance than either would be the line of connexion with Central Africa just indicated. To British trade the advantages held out by it are incalculable, for by an understanding between the British and Portuguese Governments it might afford the same freedom of transit afforded by the water-way of the Congo.

The truth is that the arrangements recently concluded, as the unexpected and perhaps unwelcome result of De Brazza's exploring energy, between France and the International Association, render doubtful and remote the prospect of unrestricted access to the wide region of the Upper Congo. The Association, it may be said, has made its will, and has appointed France its residuary legatee. The demise

of the testator may not—we cannot tell—be long delayed. And in the meantime confidential relations have succeeded to former rivalry, and a narrow and retrograde commercial policy threatens to prevail. These considerations appear to us to justify our regret at the failure of the arrangement entered into with Portugal, provided that arrangement had been extended by the acceptance of other Powers. The case is one which admits of no exclusive privileges or agreements. Mere national rivalry would be singularly out of place, where the only real contest lies between civilisation and barbarism; and the future of the Congo can only be fairly regulated by opening those waters on equal conditions and under reasonable regulations to the commerce of the world.

ART. VII.—*The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, chiefly told in his own Letters.* Edited by his son, FREDERICK MAURICE. In two volumes. London: 1884.

WHEN, shortly after the death of Frederick Denison Maurice, some friend offered to present a portrait of him to the Royal Academy, no one of the then Council, the editor of his 'Life' assures us, had ever heard his name or knew anything about him. If this report agrees strictly with the fact, we have in it something more than an illustration of the manysidedness of English life. The temptation to think that our names have travelled far beyond the utmost limits which they have reached is common enough; and great activity in one sphere of work may serve even as a hindrance to any appreciation of the worker in another. But there are cases to which we might suppose that this remark could not be applied; and the career of one who exercised great influence over many Englishmen of almost every class under conditions of unusual difficulty might be regarded as such an exception. That Mr. Maurice lived and worked through some of the most critical periods in the recent history of the English nation, and that, whether seen or unnoticed, he had much to do with shaping the course of that history, is as little to be disputed as the warmth of the affection which he awakened in those who knew him best. His friend Charles Kingsley was assuredly saying simply what he meant, when he spoke of him as 'the most beautiful human soul whom God has ever, in His great mercy, allowed me, most unworthy, to meet with upon this earth.' The language of many

other friends gives utterance to a love and reverence not less deep and strong. In those who had little or no personal knowledge of him, the impression left by his words awakened feelings often of the most opposite kinds; and of those who were thus attracted or repelled, many were men who had attained a prominence or notoriety which he shunned and dreaded for himself, men who had done or were doing their utmost to shape great ecclesiastical or theological movements to ends which they regarded as indispensable for the welfare, if not for the very existence, of the English Church and nation. With some of these men he was brought directly into conflict; others, with whose beliefs his own convictions were in the most profound antagonism, were scarcely aware of the power which thus counteracted their own purposes; and others, again, who felt that he and they were fighting on different sides, were as little capable of appreciating the causes and grounds of his opposition as the Council of the Royal Academy were capable of estimating the character of a man of whom they had never heard.

The Oxford movement, set on foot more than half a century ago, presents, with its far-reaching consequences, one of the most remarkable phases in the history of any religious body. It was the work of earnest and determined men, who looked on the English Church as wellnigh sick unto death; it was an effort to reawaken her to what they regarded as her true life, and, by restoring her ancient constitution and discipline, to maintain her title to be regarded as a living branch of Christendom. It ran essentially in the direction of outward organisation and government; and although there was no lack of assurances that Englishmen had nothing to fear from walking in the paths pointed out to them, there was no attempt to disguise the fact that the vision which rose before their eyes was in harmony rather with the spirit of Dunstan and Lanfranc than with that of Wycliffe or of Baxter. Notes of alarm were soon sounded, and the usual signs of party opposition were raised by the dominant religious schools of the day; but the real check to the work of the movement came not so much from the so-called Evangelical clergy and laity as from a few men who were content to set forth what they felt to be the true principles of Christian unity and Christian life, and to trust to the power of those principles for checking the advancing tide of sacerdotalism. Among these men the most resolute and the most consistent were Arthur Stanley and Frederick Maurice.

These two men, although working in the same spirit and for the same ends, and united in a friendship which was never broken, were strangely unlike each other. Stanley, by a few years the younger of the two, had been brought up chiefly under the influence of one commanding mind, with which his own was, as nearly as might be, in complete harmony. The teaching of Arnold had thoroughly cleared the path before him. He had much to learn, but he could learn without misgiving, not because he rested on the authority of his master, but because that master had charged him always to exercise his own judgement and test the truth of his belief and the accuracy of his conclusions. Whatever might be his faults, his mistakes, or his blunders, the language of Arnold, in its complete freedom from all reservations and all equivocations, was always transparently clear; and with Stanley the expression of his thought was, for the same reason, transparently clear also. He could protest strongly and decidedly against a false or groundless proposition, and he could withstand a mischievous thinker or an unscrupulous party leader without caring much to bring into prominence the points on which they might yet be agreed. Gifted with a keen historical imagination, he could make the past live as vividly as the present, but without dressing it up in colours, or ascribing to it features not really belonging to the age with which he was dealing. His utterances might provoke strong dissent and even indignation; but the bitterest of his opponents could not accuse him of the least tendency to morbidness either in thought or in language.

Mr. Maurice, on the other hand, was born into a family many of whose members, as they grew up, became less and less satisfied with the religious and intellectual conditions under which they lived. Feeling that the theological school to which his father belonged furnished no adequate or wholesome food for either mind or heart, he experienced in his early years a conflict from which Stanley was wholly free; but he came out from it with the assurance that the Church of England was a special instrument for bearing witness to the Divine light and for proclaiming the good tidings of the Divine love always and everywhere. This message had worked its way into his inmost being. His profound conviction of its absolute truth led him to see the assertion of it in propositions and documents where others looked for it in vain; and for this reason, as well as perhaps from other causes, he grew up in the habit of assuming rather than

hoping that they who shrank most determinately from his arguments or from the conclusions to which they led were yet at bottom in essential agreement with himself. All men were accustomed to make positive and negative assertions. In the former, he held that they were always, or almost always, right; in the latter, almost invariably wrong. Hence, in all discussions or controversies, an extreme anxiety to bring out the points of agreement between himself and others led him into expositions which, first attracted and then violently repelled his opponents. By a method which tended to become monotonous, they were told that the books or formulæ on which they relied were an expression not of their beliefs but of his own. Hence also it became, or seemed to become, a fashion with him to assert that statements conveyed to himself a meaning precisely the converse of that which they conveyed to others, and taught him just those lessons which in other eyes they seemed most glaringly to contradict. He thus acquired a reputation for paradox which kept many at a distance, and which was not always dispelled on a nearer approach; for the closer view commonly exhibited Mr. Maurice as charging himself with worse mistakes, greater ignorance, and more obstinate ill-doing than his opponents. This systematic self-depreciation was beyond question thoroughly sincere, and it formed from the first a marked feature in his character. At the beginning of his residence at Cambridge, Julius Hare spoke of the pupil whose metaphysical powers were among the greatest he had ever come in contact with, but who was so shy that it was almost impossible to know him. Mr. Gladstone speaks in like manner of the fastidiousness of conscience which impelled him to destroy any amount of work rather than allow any work to go forth to the world which might be mischievous. Appearing in the eyes of his friends, and not without reason, far too prone to overtax his strength, he accuses himself of strong impulses to idleness and of sitting often with his paper before him, doing nothing, from sheer inactivity of mind. Later on, he begins to 'feel something of the intense 'pride and atheism of his own heart, of its hatred to truth, 'of its utter lovelessness.' To one who wished to become his pupil, he speaks of his unfitness for the office, 'if regard 'be had to blunders oft repeated and to long periods of 'aimless search and melancholy listlessness.' This pupil afterwards declared that he overtaxed his powers until he fancied that physical exhaustion was want of conscientious

energy. Such a condition, if not actually within the borders of morbid feeling, is not very far removed from them ; and it must gradually have sapped his moral strength had there not been a counteracting force in his singleness of heart and his sincerity of will. The pupil, Sir E. Strachey, whose reminiscences we have already cited, does not look upon him as possessed of a strong will in the ordinary sense in which it must be possessed by every successful soldier and statesman ; but he pronounces him nevertheless the strongest man he had ever known—‘if it be strength to do steadily to the end the work that is set before a man, undeterred by any doubts or difficulties, however great or many ;’ and he insists that in Maurice this was the strength not of self-assertion but of self-surrender.

It might perhaps be questioned whether the record of such a life as this would be best thrown into the form chosen by its editor. Colonel Maurice has left his father to tell his own story, chiefly in his letters ; but as Mr. Maurice often complained of the persistency with which persons misunderstood him, so not seldom his letters were answers not to what his correspondents had really written, but to what he supposed them to have written. This fact, admitted by his son, should be carefully remembered by the readers of these volumes ; but although we may sometimes be tempted to wish that we had both sides of the correspondence, we are far from wishing that these volumes were larger than they are.

We must not, however, dwell on the shape or the execution of a work* in which we can notice only a few out

* It was Mr. Maurice's opinion that no man's life ought to be published till twenty years after his death. Colonel Maurice has judged quite rightly that in so saying his father could not have intended to lay down an inviolable rule ; nor can we see that anything would have been gained, while much might have been lost, by adhering to the letter rather than to the spirit of his words. But haste can hardly be pleaded for minor faults or mistakes which a more careful revision of the text might have removed ; and the editor expresses his personal and special thanks to a friend for the particular care with which he went through the proofs of the work. It is unfortunate that he should not have seen and corrected the blunder which makes Mr. Field ‘editor of ‘various works in patriotic and theological literature’ (vol. i. p. 52, note), and Mr. W. G. Ward a Bachelor of Arts in 1844 (vol. i. p. 390), or such slips as the following : ‘men whom he believed could not bear ‘the light of day’ (vol. ii. p. 512), ‘making a new test for select ‘spirits, whom he believed would be as great a curse for the world’

of the multitude of important questions treated in its pages. We are not telling the story of Mr. Maurice's life; still less is it any part of our purpose to determine the correctness or incorrectness, the truth or the falsehood, of his belief and opinions generally. Our object is simply to measure, so far as we can, the influence which they exercised on the thought of the day, and the degree in which they moulded and modified the personal character of the man.

In most strongly marked natures there are early indications of the kind of work which the man will feel himself called upon to do; and perhaps few more significant indications could be found than in some letters and papers of Mr. Maurice written at the time of his taking orders in the English Church. The purpose thus indicated is not one which is generated by a zeal akin to that of St. Paul before his conversion, but one which has its root in the conviction of a universal and all-embracing love, and of a righteousness eternally opposed to all ungodliness and wrong. It was no misfortune for Mr. Maurice that the time of his taking orders was delayed till he had entered on his twenty-ninth year. The self-denial which, in order to avoid giving pain to his father, led him to betake himself to a training for the law, was maturing in him the unselfishness which made him absolutely fearless whenever the exertion of true moral courage was called for. We can therefore understand the fulness of meaning with which he would specify the erroneous and strange doctrines which on admission to the priesthood he should feel himself bound to banish and put away. His answer, saying nothing of resistance to or rejection of Church authority, of extravagant notions connected with instantaneous conversion, or of leanings to Tridentine theology, goes straight to points affecting the very foundations of the Christian life. Among the doctrines which in the simplest words he enumerates, are those which assert that there is

(vol. ii. p. 608). In the second volume, pp. 443-448, we have three letters addressed to 'the Rev. J. De la Touche.' The name should be 'J. Dignes-La-Touche.' These letters are not named in the index, which sins largely in being generally over-full and minute. Here and there we come across passages which, as they stand, are unintelligible. The following sentence is altogether baffling: 'The weak confounding 'the strange, unwonted experience to feel that Christianity is the 'highest philosophy, and that Christianity is a mere phrase or name 'without a Church' (vol. i. p. 299).

any bar to the admission of a sinner to God's presence, except that which his own unbelief creates; that in God there is the least darkness or selfishness; that men are more anxious to attain the knowledge of God than He is anxious to bring them to that knowledge; that it is a privilege to be allowed to commit iniquity instead of a privilege to be delivered from iniquity; and that man can worship God except in the Spirit.

It is, of course, possible that a man taking his place in the ranks of the clergy with such convictions as these might be led into a line of thought which would commit him to strong sacramental theories. At the least he might on some points have his sympathies with those who had embraced such theories rather than with those who made the dealings of God with man turn on mere arbitrary selection, or who held that the assurance of indefectibility was proof absolute of the fact. For a time it seemed as though it might be thus with Mr. Maurice. There were those at Oxford who were ready to welcome, as belonging to their side or party, any who opposed the movement for admitting dissenters to the University or deprecated the abolition of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles required of every student at the time of his matriculation. There were considerations, derived, as he thought, both from logic and from experience, which led Mr. Maurice to agree with them on the latter point. But the motives by which he and they were severally actuated were radically and irreconcilably different. A little time only was needed to exhibit the divergence with startling clearness. He was thinking of a society or union embracing all mankind in Christ, the teaching and guidance in which body came directly from God through Him. This body was for Him the body of Christ, in which the baptised claimed for themselves a state which Christ claimed and won for all men without exception. They were thinking of a visible corporation in which Christ was represented by a visible priesthood, through whom alone the food needed for their spiritual life could be transmitted to the faithful. Before all things it was necessary that the integrity of this visible body should be maintained, and they were content to work for it without troubling themselves about difficulties which might hereafter arise from their theories or their position.

The movement in which they were engaged was indeed to be diverted to issues as unexpected as those which startled the world in the phases of the great struggle between the Northern and Southern States of the American Union. As

in this conflict a quarrel, to all appearance purely political, resolved itself into a moral debate, so the great ecclesiastical revival of the present century had its origin in efforts made to carry out certain political principles. Cardinal Newman has told the story of these old days in his 'Apologia;' the account given by Mr. Maurice in one of his autobiographical letters is in close agreement with it. The agitation attending the passage of the Reform Bill awakened in the Liberal party a wish for further changes, and especially changes affecting the Church. Lord Stanley's Bill abolished ten Irish bishoprics, and the party of reform took courage to attack the system of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles in the University of Oxford. The first of these measures, Mr. Maurice remarks, gave rise to the Tractarian movement, the other involved a question which came closely home to himself. At Cambridge he had been unable to take his degree because he had declined to comply with the rule which required the candidate to declare himself a *bona-fide* member of the Church of England. On entering the University of Oxford he had not hesitated to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles. The reasons which seemed to him to justify this course brought him to the following definite conclusions :—

'That the Cambridge demand was much more distinctly and formally exclusive than the Oxford, inasmuch as it involved a direct renunciation of Nonconformity; that the subscription to articles on entering Oxford was not intended as a test, but as a declaration of the terms on which the University proposed to teach its pupils, upon which terms they must agree to learn; that it is fairer to express those terms than to conceal them; that they are not terms which are to bind down the student to certain conclusions beyond which he cannot advance, but are helps to him in pursuing his studies, and warnings to him against hindrances and obstructions which past experience shows that he will encounter in pursuing them; that they are not unfit introductions to a general education in humanity and physics, because they are theological, but on that very account are valuable, because the superstitions which interfere with this education are associated with theology and can only be cleared away by theology; that the Articles, if used for the purposes of study and not as terms of communion for Churchmen generally, which they are not and never can be, may contribute to the reconciliation of what was positive in all Christian sects.' (Vol. i. p. 181.)

We can well understand that the terms of the great compromise which was to bring the Church of England safely through its revolt against the Papacy should carry with them a sense of freedom for those who had not already travelled beyond their range. The limits must be wide which should

comprehend those who accepted literally the old theology with those who had imbibed in whatever measure the spirit of Luther and of Calvin. Thankful for the sense of freedom thus attained, Mr. Maurice startled his friend Mr. (afterwards Sir Thomas) Acland by telling him that he looked on subscription as a defence of liberty, and that he was prepared to uphold it as such. These tidings Mr. Acland carried with him to Oxford, where the leaders of the newly formed party, intent on resisting the bill relating to subscription, were ready, as Colonel Maurice expresses it, 'to welcome an ally who 'could attack their opponents in flank, almost in rear, even 'though his base of operation was very different from theirs.' Their request, made through Mr. Acland, that he should write a pamphlet on the subject, filled him with astonishment. At the time when he received his friend's letter he was preparing one to him, containing many solid reasons why his thoughts 'could never be regarded with any other feelings than those of distrust by the High Church party.' For the moment he seems to have indulged the hope that they might, after all, be able to work together. The pamphlet was written, was laid before Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey, and was accepted by both as 'one contribution to the cause 'which they were advocating,' although neither, as he supposed, could have liked the tone of it. For a little while longer there was no formal breach; but the end came in 1836, when some of his friends urged him to become a candidate for the Professorship of Political Economy. In the interval, Dr. Pusey had put forth fully and definitely, on the subject of baptism, propositions which, in Mr. Maurice's eyes, struck at the very root of Christianity and of all religion. He was not aware, Colonel Maurice tells us, that the proposal to get him elected to the professorship was part of a plan set on foot by the leaders of the Oxford movement for obtaining the chief chairs in the University for adherents of their own party; but he perfectly understood that he was to receive the general support of those who had connected themselves with the movement. It was, therefore, the more necessary for him to set forth his own convictions with reference to Dr. Pusey's views on baptism; and this he did in the second of a series of letters addressed to Quakers, asserting that in baptism we claim the position which Christ has claimed for all mankind, and therefore that regeneration was not a change of nature, but 'the coming out of the infant under the first influence of 'a light that had always been shining for it and all the 'world,' just as at the moment of birth from its mother's

womb the babe came for the first time under influences which were not less existing for all mankind before it was born. This letter produced its inevitable result. The eyes of the Oxford leaders were opened. Dr. Pusey denounced his humility as a sham, and his earnestness of speech as an impertinence. The men who had undertaken to support him ranged themselves in determined opposition, and his name was withdrawn from a hopeless contest. But nothing was gained or lost by this declaration of war. The very constitution of Maurice's mind, and the nature of all his convictions, had from the first predetermined the issue.

Thirty years later, Dean Stanley was striving to bring about the change which, in his tract entitled 'Subscription 'no Bondage,' Mr. Maurice had deprecated as uncalled for and mischievous. During the interval Mr. Maurice had reflected earnestly on the principles laid down in his old pamphlet, and to these he still adhered, while he abandoned unreservedly the practical conclusion which he had drawn from them. He had come to see long ago that it was inapplicable to the Universities; he now saw that, being inapplicable there, it must be equally so for those who take orders. He was, therefore, quite prepared to sign any petition for the entire abolition of subscription either for laymen or clergymen. But his motive in doing this was the hope that the value and authority of the Articles would thus be more widely felt and acknowledged, and that men would be brought more and more to see that the foundations of all their knowledge must be laid in theology. With this motive he supposed that the well or ill defined party which, so far as it was known at all, was known as the Broad Church, would have no sympathy, and therefore that between himself and them there was a radical opposition. It seems never to have occurred to him that a definition of the term theology, as it presented itself to his own mind, might do much towards removing a notion which might possibly be nothing more than the result of a misunderstanding. Without so defining it, he carried on the contention with a vehemence which seemed scarcely consistent with his habitual distrust and depreciation of himself. In his belief the English Church was the witness for that universal redemption which the forms of other religious bodies tended more or less to limit or qualify. But this position, he insists, was strictly a theological one.

'Every hope I had for human culture, for the reconciliation of opposing schools, for blessings to mankind, was based on theology. What sympathy, then, could I have with the Liberal party, which was

emphatically anti-theological, which was ready to tolerate all opinions in theology, only because people could know nothing about it, and because other studies were much better pursued without reference to it? The Liberals were clearly right in saying that the Articles did not mean, to those who signed them at the Universities or on taking orders, what I supposed them to mean, and I was wrong. They were right in saying that subscription did mean to most the renunciation of a right to think, and, since none could renounce that right, it involved dishonesty. All this I have been compelled by the evidence of facts sorrowfully to confess. I accept the humiliation. I give the Liberals the triumph which they deserve. But they feel, and I feel, that we are not a step nearer to each other in 1870 than we were in 1835. They have acquired a new name. They are called Broad Churchmen now, and they delight to be called so. But their breadth seems to me to be narrowness. They include all kinds of opinions. But what message have they for the people who do not live upon opinions or care for opinions? Are they children of God, or must they now and for ever be children of the devil? The Broad Churchman gives no answer. 'To me life is a burden unless I can find one.' (Vol. i. p. 184.)

Question after question is forced on us by this strange passage, if words can be called strange which are only a sample of expressions of a like character recurring in almost every one of Mr. Maurice's writings. Who are the men of whom he is speaking? Do they form, or have they ever formed or thought of forming, a compact and coherent ecclesiastical or religious party? What is the toleration or inclusion of all kinds of opinions here spoken of? Is it true that all to whom others have given, or who have themselves claimed, the name of Broad Churchmen refuse to give any answer to the questions put by Mr. Maurice? The name Broad Church was, as Colonel Maurice admits, first brought before the world in the pages of this Journal,* and, as he also admits, it was applied by Dean Stanley not as a badge of party, but as a protest against party. The Church, Dr. Stanley insisted, was by the very conditions of its being not High or Low, but Broad, and he dismissed as merely fanciful the division of the Church into schools which, in reference to the point at issue, have no existence at all. Three years later the article on Church Parties, also contributed to this Journal by Mr. Coneybeare, uses the term Broad Church as at the time an acknowledged party designation. The fact proves only that terms will sometimes or often acquire connotations which they were not at the outset designed to bear; but Dean Stanley, who first employed the term, was

not a man to be frightened by the later application of it. He was not afraid to speak of himself as an Erastian of the Erastians, and we have had occasion to note the pride with which he took to himself the title of latitudinarian, and the calmness with which, when taunted with the coldness of some latitudinarians, he would reply that there had been worldly High Churchmen and self-seeking or hypocritical Puritans.* But, unless Dean Stanley is not to be reckoned among Liberals, it is obviously untrue to say that Liberals are necessarily indifferent to theology, or careless as to opinions, or heedless of the good and evil issues bound up with them, or that they are unable or unwilling to declare, in language as clear as Mr. Maurice himself could have desired, their convictions as to the relations between God and man. We need only refer our readers again to our article on Dean Stanley's last published work for an emphatic refutation of Mr. Maurice's charge that all Liberals treat theology as a useless study from which all other studies should be kept sedulously distinct. For those who have any real acquaintance with Dean Stanley's writings (and, whatever may be his prominence, he is yet happily only one of many who are animated by the same spirit) such a picture will appear nothing better than a caricature. Mr. Maurice often puts forth his profoundest convictions in order to bring out most forcibly the delusions, denials, or unbelief of those who are hindering the advance of the Divine kingdom; and when they are most strongly emphasised they become often most readily intelligible. In this shape we may say without fear that there is hardly a single statement made by Mr. Maurice which would not have been accepted with the heartiest agreement by Dean Stanley. The only real difference between the two is that Stanley's clearer and more methodical intellect could deal altogether more decisively with questions which Maurice approached, or seemed to approach, from many sides, but which he often appeared to leave undetermined. Dean Stanley was content to dismiss, as worse than impolitic, the imposition on the minds of youths or men at the threshold of manhood of a vast multitude of propositions the exact meaning of which could be grasped only by the persistent study of years; but he felt no temptation to hold up this crowd of propositions as conditions under which pupils at the University were to

* *Edinburgh Review*, October 1881, p. 318, art. 'Dean Stanley's 'Christian Institutions.'

be trained in every branch of learning. It is more than likely that he would have doubted or denied the fact that they were ever intended to serve such a purpose, and assuredly he would have contended that, if such a purpose had been contemplated, little or nothing could be gained by drawing out the preliminary conditions of a bargain with such astonishing minuteness.

That Mr. Maurice's convictions were throughout his life not merely profound, but absolutely sincere, no one will dream of disputing. That he often exaggerated the differences between himself and others whose words or acts he could not approve, few, apart from the small company of his immediate adherents or disciples, will be for a moment tempted to doubt. From first to last he beheld with pain and grief the perversity with which men shut their eyes to the real facts and purposes of their existence. He was ready, as he said, to live and die for the assertion of the truth 'that the Church is a witness for the true constitution of man as man, a child of God, an heir of heaven, and taking up his freedom by baptism; that the world is a miserable, accursed, rebellious order, which denies this foundation, which will create a foundation of self-will, choice, taste, opinion; that in the world there can be no communion; that in the Church there can be universal communion, communion in one body by one Spirit.'* Of these truths he regarded the Church of England as the only firm consistent witness; but the Church itself was not confined to the limits of the Church of England or of any other visibly organised society in Christendom, while the truths themselves belonged to the eternal world and could not be affected by the language or the acts of any Christian or professedly Christian body. They were truths on which the salvation of men, or, in other words, their cleansing and healing, their deliverance from sin and evil, depended; they were truths which all, in whatever state, were bound to proclaim in the face of all opposition, indifference, or contempt, and which the Church of England, like all other Churches, could disregard only by deserting the standard under which it professed to fight and taking its place amongst the ranks of the enemies of God. For himself the proclamation of these truths must be the one paramount task of his life, in season and out of season, without thought of results or consequences. It was his business, as it had been the business of the long

* Vol. i. p. 166.

line of Hebrew prophets, to testify to the present immediate working of God, to the universal action of His law of truth and righteousness, of holiness and love. Between himself and them, except in the degree in which each saw the light of the Eternal Word, he recognised and admitted no distinction. They were prophets, not in the least as predicting effects apart from their causes, but strictly as setting forth the nature of God's work in the world, as declaring that men were in their true state only in so far as they submitted themselves to the law of love, and that they fell into a state of misery and death in so far as they substituted their own wills and inclinations in its place. He believed that he had been sent into the world charged with this mission of bearing witness to the light which is shining for all men, though they may choose to shut their eyes to it; and, in reference to this his life's task, his friend Sir E. Strachey eagerly declares that, living and dying 'in the assurance of the reality of this light, he has borne a witness of its reality of which they who knew him best know best the power.'*

But the charge thus laid on himself was laid on others also. In special measure it must be laid on the clergy who had deliberately acknowledged compliance with it to be their highest duty. If, in spite of this, there was still so much of disorder, of ignorance, of unbelief everywhere, at whose door must the blame in great part lie? On this point he had no doubt. He was sure that for the prevalent restlessness amongst both old and young the clergy were more answerable than all other people.

'I think,' he said, 'we have never told them fairly the blessed secret of their existence. The religion we have preached has been a thing so much external to themselves—an effort to obtain something afar off in some distant region, in some distant age. How little have we said to them, or made our words intelligible to them if we have, "The kingdom of God is near you; the kingdom of God is within you"! It is what all are longing to hear. They wish to be governed, and they want to find that they have really a gracious invisible Governor over their spirits, who can give them their right direction and mould them according to His will. Without this conviction there must be the sense of perpetual strain and effort to be something which, at the same time, we know that we cannot be, or we must give up the whole struggle in despair. I do not believe we have any of us a notion what good news we have to declare to human beings if we could but bring it out. It is our own stupidity and darkness about truths which at times seem light

itself, one's consciousness of throwing them outside of oneself when they were within, and the confusion, weariness, and hopelessness which follow, which explain the needs and the obstinacy of others. At the same time they give one a wonderful confidence that the barrier will some day be broken down, and that the will of God must be triumphant at last over all rebellion. I feel less and less able to doubt that proposition, even as the obstacles to the belief of it in myself and others multiply, for I do find the love of God is the only power in the universe to accomplish *any* result. All must be the devil's if *it* were not at work. Shall it not in some way or other vindicate all to itself? I wish to think awfully on the question, confessing with trembling that there is an unspeakable power of resistance in our wills to God's love—a resistance quite beyond my understanding or any understanding to explain—and not denying that this resistance may be final, but still feeling myself obliged, when I trust God thoroughly, to think that there is a depth in His love below all other depths; a bottomless pit of charity deeper than the bottomless pit of evil. And I answer that to lead people to feel that this is a ground for them to stand upon is the great way of teaching them to stand. They are not made to hang poised in the air, which is the position, I fear, of a good many religious people, in a perpetual land of mist and cloud, never seeing the serene heaven nor feeling the solid earth. "God is in the midst of us, therefore we cannot be moved." What might there is in these words!

The letter in which this remarkable passage occurs was written early in 1849 to the sister of Julius Hare, who in that same year became his second wife. It obviously contains the pith of the 'Theological Essays,' published four years later, and draws out the main lines of his teaching for the remainder of his life. Without going into verbal controversies which seemingly could only show that certain thinkers were or were not on his side, he here declares in language of most significant clearness his convictions as to the nature of that inner religion underlying, as Dean Stanley held, the sentiments and usages which have accumulated round the forms of Christianity, and giving them whatever vitality they possess. The two friends were here, essentially, in thorough agreement. Both were altogether in earnest, and both were fearless in their resistance to all which they believed to be false and wrong. But, although they worked together from time to time, their lives were not, as a whole, passed in common action. Much probably might have been lost had they been so. The effect of their work was largely enhanced by their independence; and to them not merely more than to any other two men, but more perhaps than to all others then actively at work, may we trace the check first given to a movement which, whatever may have been the motives of the leaders, favoured nothing so much as the

growth of ecclesiastical power. Dean Stanley counteracted more effectually even than Dean Milman the appeal made to history and patristic authority. For all those who directly or indirectly came under his influence, Maurice, going still further, removed the whole foundation on which the fabric of an ecclesiastical religion must necessarily rest.

The thought that the new form of churchmanship set forth in the Oxford tracts seemed to represent regeneration as 'dependent on the will of God and the death of Christ, not 'the individual faith of men,' led Mr. Maurice for a moment to suppose that here there might be a real point of union between them. Dr. Pusey's tract on baptism had, as we have seen, entirely dispelled this dream.

'Instead of affording me the least warrant for the kind of teaching which appeared to me alone Scriptural and practical, it made such teaching utterly impossible. The baptised child was holy for a moment after its baptism; in committing sin it lost its purity. That could only be recovered by acts of repentance and a system of ascetical discipline. I remember to this day the misery which this tract caused me as I read it in a walk to one of the London suburbs; I saw that I must be hopelessly and for ever estranged from this doctrine and from those who taught it, unless I abandoned all hopes for myself and for the world.' (Vol. i. p. 237.)

Assured that we can have no goodness apart from Christ, and that all our goodness must be by union with Him who is perfectly good, he looked upon baptism as declaring this truth to everyone, and as being moreover 'the act in which 'the Holy Spirit takes the charge of us and promises to 'guide us into the knowledge and love of Christ if we will 'submit to His guidings; the Lord's Supper to be that in 'which we may have life, and have it more abundantly by 'ever-fresh communication from the source of it.'* The sacerdotal theories which, as he expressed it in the last year of his life, attempt to bring Christ back to the altar, seemed to him to involve the most flagrant denial of the Ascension, and therefore of the whole faith of Christendom, that could be imagined; and his emphatic conclusion was that 'we give 'up everything to them if we charge them with an excess of 'belief: the complaint should be of their unbelief.'† In fact, for him the spiritual atmosphere of this country at that time resembled nothing so much as that of Palestine in the days of Herod and Pilate. The people were being dosed with religion when they wanted not this but the living God.

* Vol. i. p. 231.

† Vol. ii. p. 627.

‘We give them a stone for bread, systems for realities; they despair of ever attaining what they need. The upper classes become, as may happen, sleekly devout for the sake of good order, avowedly believing that one must make the best of the world without God; the middle classes try what may be done by keeping themselves warm in dissent and agitation to kill the sense of hollowness; the poor, who must have realities of some kind, and understanding from their betters that all but houses and lands are abstractions, must make a grasp at them or else destroy them. And the specific for all this evil is some evangelical discourse upon the Bible being the rule of faith, some High-Church cry for tradition, some liberal theory of education. Surely we want to preach it in the ears of all men, It is not any of these things or all these things together you want, or that those want who speak of them. All are pointing towards a Living Being, to know whom is life, and all, so far as they are set up for any purpose but leading us into that knowledge and so to fellowship with each other, are dead things which cannot profit. There are some things which I sometimes feel, like Dr. Arnold, I must utter or burst.’ (Vol. i. p. 370.)

Language such as this was not without its force even for those who might think his fears somewhat exaggerated and his condemnations over-severe. But in so far as it was not rejected altogether, it effectually counteracted the influence of the Oxford school; and this language was met with in every volume and in almost every page of Mr. Maurice’s writings. One lesson at least his hearers or readers could not fail to learn from him: and this was that the Divine law was unchangeable; that the Divine government was an eternal reality, embracing the whole creation, and meting out the same justice to all without respect of persons; and that the Divine will sought the good of all His creatures. Such a conviction could not fail to restore the moral balance of those who may have felt themselves overweighted by theories of exclusive covenants and of special privileges. It would make them cast aside all methods which invented, for the sins and vices of Jewish patriarchs or kings, excuses which would not be admitted as excuses for the same things now. It would teach them that they were not to do violence to the documents with which they were dealing, by converting fact into allegory or allegory into fact, and more than all would assure them that their real trust was to be placed not in a book or in a church, but in a living God, from whom comes all that is just, good, and true in men.

This teaching, which appealed straight to the moral sense of his hearers or his readers, did, in point of fact, break for many of them what may be called the spell of Hildebrandism,

and delivered them from the 'charmed dungeon'* of the Oxford leaders. But their gratitude for this deliverance would not necessarily blind their eyes to the peculiarities of the method followed by Mr. Maurice himself. Mr. Maurice, indeed, enforced these lessons everywhere. He could not fail to do so. But he remained not less assured that it was indispensably necessary for all others to discern the truth where he saw it himself, and that, unless they found it where he found it, they could not learn it at all. His own conviction of the Divine righteousness was a rock not to be shaken; but it also drove him to make a crowd of assumptions about the records in which he traced the several steps in the Divine government of the world. From the Book of Genesis he learnt the sacredness of the order of the family, the misery which comes with the infraction of it, the blessings which flow from obedience to it. The Book of Exodus taught him that God had sympathy with sufferers, that He was the judge of the tyrant, the deliverer of the bondman and the captive; and from these facts or convictions he drew the inference that the books were, throughout, trustworthy historical narratives. At the same time his respect for the letter of the narrative was not so unswerving as to satisfy the adherents of straiter schools. The incidents of Balaam's journey he resolved into a spiritual impression left on the mind of the seer.† But when the same freedom with regard to this same narrative was used by another who went on to the further question of the time of its composition, and who reached the conclusion arrived at more recently by the most eminent of modern Jewish interpreters, Mr. Maurice expressed his abhorrence not of a critical method which was too lax or too arbitrary, but of the spiritual perversity which was robbing men of lessons indispensable for the vindication of the Divine righteousness. It mattered not that Dr. Stanley spoke of the national religion of the Jews, down even to the Babylonish captivity, as a bloody and sensual idolatry, or that the Bishop of St. David's (Dr. Thirlwall) had spoken of 'a great part of the 'events related in the Old Testament' as having 'no more 'apparent connexion with our religion than those of Greek 'or Roman history.' It was enough for Mr. Maurice that the Book of Genesis enforced certain spiritual truths, and he insisted that apart from this book the knowledge of those

* Vol. i. p. 186.

† Sermons on the Old Testament, p. 226.

truths could not have been attained. He felt that a fresh need had come for the discharge of his mission, and he expressed his convictions in language which awakened, in many who owed to him a deep debt of gratitude, feelings not indeed of disagreement with his spiritual convictions, but of astonishment for a method which would prove anything or prove too much, and of amazement at what seemed a multitude of groundless fancies urged with the gravest seriousness. The lessons of the Book of Exodus were or had been needed by Englishmen. Englishmen had been sorely oppressed by the ecclesiastical yoke before the Reformation, and deception had gone hand in hand with tyranny. Others might wonder at, but he himself failed to see, the irrelevance of the tirade called forth by the thought of England in the days of the Tudor sovereigns.

‘If there was a Lord God who had proclaimed His commands out of heaven amidst thunders and lightnings; if He was really what He said that He was, a Lord God who brought His people out of bondage; if He had indeed redeemed slaves in Egypt out of the hands of a tyrant; if He had plagued the tyrant, and thrown his hosts into the sea; if He had led the poor captives through that sea; if He had fed them with manna; if He was the same from generation to generation, then England might live; then Englishmen might hold up their heads against their foes, and rise up, were they ever so sunken, in the might of Him who had promised not to forsake them or to forget them.’

Such comments, it is clear, might be drawn out to any extent, and Mr. Maurice had at his command a wealth of illustrations which proved that the lessons taught by the Book of Exodus were living lessons.

‘They raised the English middle classes into moral and political existence; they ratified the great oath of the Swiss peasants at Rütli; they raised the Dominican Savonarola to be the witness against Alexander VI.; they made the German monk mightier than Charles V.; their echoes woke again among the peasants of the Tyrol; they stirred the scholars of Germany to a new life; they roused the Czar of the Russias to drive back the invader who had profaned the holy shrines of Moscow.’

If it was the Book of Exodus, and this book only, which taught all these men these lessons, there ought surely to be some record of the fact. The force of the lessons is not disputed; but the fact that the peasants of Rütli had any intimate familiarity with the narratives of that book, or that some of them had any knowledge of them at all, is one rather to be proved than assumed. It is, to say the least, not less likely that Harold and the English army who

fought under him at Senlac may have been nerved to the struggle by the story of the deliverance of the Israelites in Egypt. There has rarely been an invasion marked by more monstrous wrong than that of the Norman Conqueror. The lives and the freedom of Englishmen were threatened by one who was steeped in falsehood and perjury. We cannot doubt that Harold prayed as earnestly as any Jewish bondman that the crime of his assailant might be punished by the righteous Avenger of wrong. We cannot doubt that, after he had fallen, his people prayed through many a weary year for succour from Him who had overthrown the chariots and horsemen of Pharaoh; but the succour nevertheless came not, and therefore for them such comfort as they could have must be found elsewhere. We are treading indeed on dangerous ground, and if some should be led to transgress the limits of reverence, the fault will be as much that of Mr. Maurice as their own. We are not, however, refuting or upholding his arguments; we simply seek to show his mode of dealing with evidence, if indeed that can be shown which seems at every turn to elude our grasp. We have lately* had occasion to discuss the trustworthiness of Herodotus, and have given our reasons for reaching certain conclusions on the subject. But Mr. Maurice insists that some of the facts which we learn from him, and only from him, do not really rest on his testimony. The victories of Salamis and Plataea are truths rather than facts. They are 'taken out of the region of letters. They do not depend any longer on the credibility of records. They have established themselves in the very existence of humanity. You cannot displace them without denying that, or re-making it anew, according to some theory or fashion of your own.'

Mr. Maurice's utterances on this subject, we are bound to say, were unintelligible to us twenty years ago; they remain unintelligible still. We have not found in the interval, any more than we had found then, any third way of preserving the memory of events besides written contemporary records or oral tradition; nor have we come across any solid reasons for affirming that as soon as an alleged event is shown to convey some high lesson, it passes out of the region of letters, and may be taken as its own evidence. Mr. Maurice speaks of a disciple of Sir Cornewall Lewis who 'believes in nothing but contemporary testimonies,' and he retorts: 'I ask

* *Edinburgh Review*, April 1884, art. 'Sayce's Herodotus.'

‘him how Sir G. Lewis came to believe that, with all the ‘proofs which the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny ‘gave him of its utter untrustworthiness.’* The question in no way delivers us from our bewilderment. Mr. Maurice recurs to the subject in a letter to Mr. D. J. Vaughan on his book on ‘Scientific Evidences,’ and thus delivers judgement on what he considers the ‘marvellous scepticism, ‘upheld by an equally marvellous credulity,’ of Sir Cornewall Lewis :—

‘Sir G. C. Lewis could believe in no evidence coming to his own reason and conscience; he could, after living through the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny, depend upon the contemporary testimony which told him one day that the defeats of the Russians were entirely due to the French, the next that the French had almost no share in them; one day that hundreds of men and women were mutilated by the Sepoys, the next that there were none.’ (Vol. ii. p. 510.)

If our bewilderment gives place to a weaker feeling or even vanishes, it is only because we reach the conclusion that when a question is treated thus, words are only wasted. We might ask whether Mr. Maurice disbelieved absolutely the occurrence of the Crimean war and of the Indian mutiny. Whatever notions any may entertain about either of these events, we have never heard of any except contemporary evidence as adduced in support of them. If Mr. Maurice knew of any testimony which had fallen down from Jupiter, he has given no hint of his knowledge. But, in truth, all Mr. Maurice’s declamation comes from the familiar logical fault of an undistributed middle. Sir Cornewall Lewis never said that all contemporary testimony was of necessity absolutely trustworthy; and most assuredly he never would have allowed, and few probably will concede, that all must be worthless because some may be false. *Solvuntur risu tabule.*

Mr. Maurice, his son informs us, ‘always complained that ‘Dr. Stanley looked at things from a purely historical point of view.’† We cannot regard the fact, if it be one, as a subject for regret, or doubt that Dean Stanley owed to it very much of the freedom and strength which characterised his work. Not less convinced than Mr. Maurice of the reality of the Divine kingdom, both present and future, Dean Stanley was perfectly familiar with the changes of human thought, and of the outward signs which serve as the expression of that thought; but through the variations which thus

* Vol. ii. p. 450.

† Vol. ii. p. 601.

became inevitable he was able to trace the truth or the notion which lay beneath them all, and to determine its importance or its value. We need only refer to the history of the ordinance of baptism, as showing that during the long series of the Christian ages its character has been singularly changed in every respect except that of its spiritual significance. But we have already remarked* that this knowledge awakened in him no feverish anxiety lest such changes should involve the loss of the living reality. The causes which had already modified the shell or covering might modify it again or even remove it; and he fully admitted that theological terms existed for the instruction and benefit of the people at large, and that, if they should be found more potent for mischief than for good, they must give way to others more likely to express their meaning accurately. This attitude of mind in reference to the institutions of Christendom generally involved no necessary antagonism with Mr. Maurice's fundamental convictions; but it was one which Mr. Maurice could scarcely understand, and for which he could feel little sympathy or indulgence. Of the Divine life and righteousness as the only source of life and righteousness in man, and of the quickening, strengthening, and perfecting of this life as the one end of the Divine work in the world, Mr. Maurice was absolutely assured; but he had the same positive confidence as to the stages through which that work had passed or was to pass still. For the order of these steps or stages he was scarcely less zealous than the most rigid historical critic could be for the evidence adducible for theories relating to the growth of the civil or canon law. His own belief as to these steps or stages he could not regard as a matter for critical scrutiny. The evidence of its truth must be found in the heart, in the sense of its wants, in the answer of the Divine voice to the cry for light and guidance. We are far from saying that Mr. Maurice's view was unjustifiable; but we protest strenuously against the implication that no other views are admissible, and we notice with a certain feeling of wonder the negative positions into which, in spite of his horror of negations, he is not unfrequently betrayed. In a remarkable letter addressed to his father, and giving the reasons for his dissatisfaction with the school of opinion in which he had been brought up, Mr. Maurice, speaking of the condition of the prophets and saints in the Old Testament, maintains that God might be revealed to them as their law-

* *Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1881, p. 305.

giver or sovereign, but that they had no means of knowing Him as their friend.* We might be tempted to reply that such a conclusion seems out of harmony with the language of the Old Testament generally, and most particularly with that of the Psalms. We might urge that the latter have been used in all ages of the Christian Church as the highest expressions of that fervent feeling as of personal friendship and trust which marks the furthest stage on the road to perfection reached by the holiest of saints on earth. But we shrink from what might be a mere strife of words. We are not sure that we know the precise meaning which Mr. Maurice might attach to the terms 'friend' and 'friendship,' and the attempt to deal with the proposition as it stands might be met with the retort that we had mistaken his drift. We may content ourselves, therefore, with saying that not only is it possible, without confining ourselves to his point of view, to form a clear and coherent conception of that great unfolding of Divine truth for which revelation is only a Latin name, but that his method is by no means free from the dangers of a verbalism against which he would have been one of the first to protest. From time to time we come across terms which are, to say the least, perplexing; and indeed he was himself conscious that many might find a difficulty in following his line of thought on questions of supreme importance. Granting that there may be a hundred thousand simpler faiths than his own, he asks 'what is the worth of simplicity if it does not account for facts which we know, if it does not satisfy wants which we feel, if it does not lead us up to the truth which we desire?'

The difficulties thus created were not removed by his habit of using familiar terms and expressions with an indefinitely extended meaning. It was not so plain to others as it was to himself that the people of England were as strictly Protestant in the days of the Plantagenets as they were under the Stuart kings; nor could it well be so plain, unless they looked on the word as denoting not merely the dissidents at the Diet of Spire in 1529, but all who have ever been animated by the spirit which he discerned in those dissidents. As he interpreted the word, 'every nation, when converted to Christianity, became a Protestant nation, i.e. recognised the God of righteousness as Him to whom its highest officer was responsible, and the only bond by which the parts are united to Him in obedience to each other in society, and protested against any other principle of national union than

* Vol. i. p. 136.

‘this.’ Protestantism was thus a term predicable of a nation and of a nation exclusively. The Church could only be Catholic, the witness and safeguard of that ecclesiastical unity and universality to which he regarded Popery as radically adverse. Protestantism asserted that God was the King of the nation; the Papacy, far more than paganism, deposed Him from His throne by declaring the sovereigns of the nations responsible to a visible Head of the Church. Hence every nation which accepted this doctrine must be a God-denying nation, because the Pope to that nation is God.* Mr. Maurice’s position involved the inconvenience of applying to a long series of centuries before the date at which it came into use a term employed at a particular time and on a particular occasion.

But if his definitions were sometimes unlooked for and strange, a still more marked character of paradox was imparted to his writings and his words by his habit of asserting the truth of affirmations made by his opponents while he rejected their negations, and then of maintaining that these affirmations were essentially in harmony with his own belief. It would follow that, though they might seem to have nothing in common with each other, they were nevertheless at bottom agreed.

‘How,’ he asks in an instructive letter written in 1848, ‘do I differ from the mere Tory? Because I look upon the Whig idea of constitutional government which he opposes as latent in his truth and as necessarily developed out of it in due season. How do I differ from both Whig and Tory? Because I look upon the Radical idea of the distinct rights and privileges of each man as latent in their two truths and as necessarily developed out of them in its due season.’ (Vol. i. p. 485.)

This habit was fostered by his modes of dealing with all schools and all opinions. He had failed to keep, or he thought that he had not kept, his self-imposed rule in his relations with John Sterling, and he bitterly reproached himself for his failure.

‘It is easy to lay down rules; it is another thing to act upon them. I believed many years ago that I ought to sympathise with those who differed from me most widely. I did not follow out my own faith. I engaged in arguments when I should have sought for the truth which was in the heart of him who was disputing with me.’ (Vol. i. p. 505.)

But if he could thus seek and find points of agreement between himself and other men, it was even more easy to

* Vol. i. p. 142.

find them in books, more especially in those which were in whatever degree authoritative. That Mr. Maurice regarded with pain and grief the utterances of the Oxford school generally, that the adherents of this school attached the greatest weight to the Athanasian Creed, and that many of their opponents treated that creed as an intolerable burden, were notorious facts. That the tone of the Oxford school was utterly different from that of Mr. Maurice, and that the form and method of the Athanasian Creed seemed to harmonise more with the former than with the latter, was scarcely less indisputable; but now, as at other times, Mr. Maurice could not help coming forward to prove not merely that this creed was not in terms inconsistent with or exclusive of his own belief, but that from it most especially he learnt the lesson which lay at the root of his deepest convictions. Far from sharing the opinion of Tillotson that it was a document of which the Church would be well rid, he upheld it as the great safeguard of the faith and trust in which he himself lived, and as leading him onwards in the path of an all-embracing charity. Any contrary opinion he regarded as 'a false impression.' But ought that creed, he asks, to convey a false impression to us?

'Should we not have a more false impression if we were without it? Is it not a false impression which makes us wish to be rid of it? What it teaches me is this: to know God is eternal life; not to know Him is eternal death. That belief, thoroughly and heartily entertained, instead of making us uncharitable, would be the very ground and root of our charity. God is the perfect charity. The Father dwelling with the Son in One Spirit is that absolute and eternal love which is the ground of all things, that upon which we may repose our hopes for ourselves and for the universe.'

Thus claiming the spirit and substance of the document as his own, he was yet confronted by its form; and in the eyes of his countrymen this form seemed to aim at and to condemn a long series of propositions which, either in terms or implicitly, had been professed by certain individual thinkers or certain schools. It looked very much like an historical enumeration of a string of heresies which had been, and of some which had not been, avowed, but which, taken together, might exhaust all possible wrong beliefs on the subjects with which it deals. In Mr. Maurice's eyes it had no such appearance. To him it had been a greater help than almost any document in getting rid of such a notion.

'If I took the Athanasian Creed to mean that anyone who does not hold certain intellectual notions about the Trinity must without doubt

perish everlastingly, I must take it to condemn not Unitarians, not Arians, not Tritheists of every kind merely, but all women, children, poor people, whose minds have not been exercised in logical inquiries, and are not capable of understanding logical results. I should take it to exempt from everlasting death not the meek and lowly of heart, but many who have been particularly the reverse of this, proud disputers who have arrived at orthodox conclusions without being in any moral state which the Holy Ghost can recognise. If you can persuade yourself that any good man who wrote such a creed in any age intended *this*, or that any good men who have repeated it since have adopted it with that intention, I cannot; I reject that sense as simply impossible. No one has a right to say what was the mind of the imposer of the creed; no one, I believe, who thinks seriously will say it. But what other sense will the words bear? Not some modification of this; not some qualified condemnation of certain persons, the others being saved; but simply the very reverse of this. 'The name of the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is, as the Fathers and Schoolmen said continually, the name of the Infinite Charity, the perfect Love, the full vision of which is that beatific vision for which saints and angels long even while they dwell in it.' (Vol. ii. p. 413.)

In thus writing, Mr. Maurice scarcely exhausted all the alternatives of view. It still remained possible that the framer of the creed, being a good man, and others who adopted it and felt themselves in agreement with it, might deny that any could be meek and lowly in heart who disputed or rejected its propositions. It still remained a fact that a document which was thus held to breathe the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount was thrown into a form which exhibited little more than an array of logical propositions balancing each other with mathematical precision. All that Mr. Maurice believed as to the meaning of the name into which all Christians are baptised was, it is needless to say, believed not less heartily by Dean Stanley; but in Dean Stanley's eyes the amplifications even of the so-called Apostles' Creed and that of Nicæa or Constantinople appeared to have but a very slight bearing on the nature of the revelation of Jesus Christ; and beyond all doubt he saw the working of a deeper faith and a more loving heart in the last words of the Nicene Creed than in the whole array of logical forms marshalled in the ranks of the confession which bears the name of Athanasius. To Gregory of Nyssa, in the last sentence of his last published work, he ascribes the concluding clause of the Nicene Creed, and he expresses the conviction that to Gregory, and through him to the council convened at Constantinople, that clause 'must have included the hope that 'the Divine justice and mercy are not controlled by the powers

‘ of evil, that sin is not eternal, and that in that world to come punishment will be corrective and not final, and will be ordered by a Love and Justice, the height and depth of which is beyond the narrow thoughts of man to conceive.’*

We reach with a feeling of relief the common ground on which Mr. Maurice and his friend were in absolute harmony. In this faith and conviction they both lived. From their trust in God as the source of all light and knowledge for man, as the fountain of truth, righteousness, and love, as planting and nourishing in man the perceptions of equity and right dealing, of impartiality and mercy, they both drew all their hope and all their strength, and both held, as a necessary consequence, that what was true, right, and just for man was so in God also, and therefore that it was not only possible for men to know God, but that the one purpose of their existence was that they should know Him. The assurance that God is just and true is, again to cite Dean Stanley’s words, ‘ the foundation with which everything in all subsequent religion must be made to agree.’† But in the popular or traditional theology of this or of other countries there was not a little which was violently out of concord with these primary and indispensable convictions ; and the adherents of certain doctrines or of certain interpretations of doctrine, which manifestly could challenge acceptance solely on the plea of authority, felt that there could be no evading of a struggle in which they must either conquer or fall altogether. Mr. Maurice had for years felt sure that there was a strong tendency in the thought of the day towards a definite ‘ setting up of religion against God.’ The onset came from one who had gained considerable reputation as a logician at Oxford, and who now, to the surprise of some, stood forth as the champion of revelation as synonymous with orthodoxy, and of orthodoxy as sanctioned by the warrant of revelation.

The story of the controversy between Mr. Maurice and Mr. Mansel forms one of the most valuable chapters in this biography. Colonel Maurice has treated the subject with impartial fairness, and has in no way overrated the good service done by his father in one of the most momentous of the discussions of the present century. Mr. Mansel professed to uphold the authority of revelation. He nowhere stated what he took revelation to be. Sometimes speaking as though revelation and the Bible, interpreted so as to agree

* Christian Institutions, p. 335.

† Ibid., p. 269 ; *Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1881, p. 298.

with certain commonly received views of religion, were synonymous terms, he more frequently, by the complete absence of anything like definition, left his hearers with the comfortable idea that revelation meant simply what he and they received. But this defence of revelation or orthodoxy was in no degree founded on its truth, still less was it based on its goodness or its justice. That men had certain ideas with regard to truth, goodness, and justice amongst themselves, he admitted; but he dismissed as a patent absurdity the inference that because certain conceptions of these qualities were found amongst men, the qualities themselves therefore existed in God. The idea that God might not or could not do anything which would run counter to or revolt the moral sense of men, he dismissed as contemptibly childish. For all that men knew, there might in the Divine nature be not a single quality which was, or was regarded as, moral in humanity. In point of fact, men knew nothing, and never could know anything, of God. There was no warrant for saying that love in man had anything in common with love in God; and the acme of absurdity was reached by those who made their human affections and wants the measure of what they might hope to receive here or hereafter. God was unknowable, and men could only bow themselves beneath the yoke which He had imposed on them. This yoke was that of religion, which came to them with an authority not to be impugned. The argument might pass muster with those who failed to notice that it involved a slight assumption, as to which Mr. Mansel kept a discreet silence. The assumption was that man, who, strive as he might, could never know that God was righteous, impartial, merciful, and loving, could yet know that He had spoken to men at all.

For Mr. Maurice, Revelation was essentially and simply the unveiling or making known to man the actual righteousness and love of God. Mr. Mansel's theory struck at the very root of this lifelong and heartfelt conviction. On the divergent issues thus laid bare, Colonel Maurice makes the following forcible remarks:—

‘There was nothing new for him in the position taken up by Mr. Mansel. Mr. Mansel's doctrine was, in its express terminology, the very one against which all through his life he had been struggling. If God was not good in the same *sense* in which Jesus of Nazareth went about doing good, his faith was vain. Nor had previous experience left him in any doubt as to the mode in which Mr. Mansel intended to employ his principle in relation to those questions which were much dearer to my father than life or reputation. . . . In a short pamphlet which he

published at the time, Mr. Mansel showed that he saw that the attempt to defend the then currently received view in regard to Elysium and Tartarus was hopeless if God's character was really shadowed forth in such sentences as "Can a mother forget her sucking child? Yea, she "may forget, yet will I never forget thee;" or if the character which Christ displayed on earth was a manifestation of the actual spirit of the eternal Godhead. Mr. Mansel had no wish to force the fiercest features of the Tartarean doctrine into any unpleasant prominence, but he had every wish to assume that what he called the "Revealed Doctrine of the "Atonement" was, as a matter of fact and beyond question, what Archbishop Magee had, some years before, declared that it was. The privilege of "the elect" was clearly, in his mind, to be saved from a certain place of future torture and to enter into an elysium of personal enjoyment. . . . But my father's proclamation of God as the friend and father of *man*, the deliverer out of sin and bondage; the habitual use of the words, "the Lamb of God which taketh away *the sin* of the "world," in contrast with the Calvinistic or current view of God's remitting the penalty which His justice had adjudged for sin; the habitual assumption that all God's punishments were blessings, not curses; that *the great evil* was not the punishment, but the sin; that the direst hell conceivable was the place where God left off punishing and left a man to his sin; all these conceptions from first to last were contemptible in Mr. Mansel's eyes, and in all his notes to his lectures he took care to leave no doubt of his intention to strike not only at the centre of my father's faith, but at every thought which formed part to him of the good news which he believed that he had learned and was to deliver.' (Vol. ii. p. 333.)

For once, in dealing with this question, Mr. Maurice departed from his usual method. He made no effort in his first replies to define the points in dispute or to claim a certain amount of agreement with his opponent. He had been deeply impressed by the temper and tone of Mr. Mansel's writings. The present Archbishop of York, then Preacher of Lincoln's Inn, had spoken to him of the matter of the lectures 'as in its essence the most unalloyed atheism that 'had been heard in England for generations.' The lecturer had been described to him 'as best known in Oxford as a 'common-room wit and joker;' and the lectures, one of them more especially, were regarded 'as scarcely serious, 'despite the tremendous nature of the subjects they handled.' With the utterances of men who wrote with the simple purpose of stating their difficulties and with the honest desire of grappling with them, and, if possible, of being rid of them, Mr. Maurice had always felt and expressed the deepest sympathy; but he was now confronted by utterances of a very different kind.

'The effect of the lectures was to deal with all men troubled with

doubts or difficulties on exactly the opposite principle . . . to give to the many the satisfaction of laughing at the earnest few who did not see their way. It was, in fact, under the name of orthodoxy, setting up the absolute domination of public opinion, the very power which my father looked upon as, in so far as it was the object of worship, the anti-Christ of the day. It represented that of which he had had in his youthful days so great a horror—the warning men “against feeling” too strongly, thinking too deeply, lest they should find too much of “the Almighty wisdom, lest they should be too conscious of the “Almighty goodness.”” (Vol. ii. p. 334.)

Thus stirred in his inmost heart, Mr. Maurice put forth with some vehemence his opinion of the spirit of the book, of the tendency exhibited in every part of it, and of its probable effects on the future course of English thought. He insisted, with the utmost plainness of speech, that ‘the ‘weapon forged in behalf of orthodoxy’ would ‘become a ‘deadly one in quite other hands.’ His words have been abundantly verified. Mr. Leslie Stephen has claimed the whole of Mr. Mansel’s argument as ‘simply and solely the ‘assertion of the first principles of Agnosticism ;’ while Mr. Herbert Spencer professes to be carrying only a step further ‘the doctrine put into shape by Hamilton and Mansel.’ That, in the discussion which ensued, Mr. Mansel should misunderstand some of Mr. Maurice’s assertions, is no surprising fact. Whether he had any valid excuse for accusing him of ‘a tissue of continuous misrepresentation which had ‘no parallel in recent literature,’ is another question. Mr. Maurice had said that one who believes that God created men for the knowledge of Himself could not listen without the profoundest interest to every cry of men after that knowledge in one age or another. Such a man must be glad to learn from their blunders as well as their successes, ‘perceiving in the first the likeness of his own; in the second, ‘the guidance of God;’ and to him ‘the remembrance of ‘hard and proud words spoken against those who were crying ‘out for truth’ would be always the bitterest in his life; ‘that which recurs to him with the keenest sense of having ‘grieved the Holy Spirit of God, of having brought upon ‘him the curse of a brother’s blood.’ Here, as elsewhere, whenever there was any work of depreciation to be done, Mr. Maurice was speaking of himself. His thoughts were running, as they often ran, with keen self-accusation, on his later intercourse with Sterling. But by an amazing misconception, or by almost incredible carelessness, Mr. Mansel applied the words to himself, and charged Mr. Maurice with denouncing

the Bampton Lectures as full of proud and hard words spoken against those who were crying out after the truth. The extravagance of the caricature might well prompt the doubt whether here too he was speaking seriously. Mr. Mansel was perfectly aware that not one word of Mr. Maurice's description applied to himself. This, however, is a point of very secondary importance. His utterances were received at first with cries of welcome by perhaps a majority in the so-called religious world, or of the newspapers which professed to represent it. Not a few have repented long ago of their ill-judged confidence, and drawn back from the gulf into which a logical following out of his theory would have plunged them. The issue of the controversy was, on the whole, far from discouraging. Mr. Maurice's expressions of personal courtesy towards Dean Mansel, and of regret, on hearing of his death, for any language of his own which might have caused pain to the Dean's friends, were interpreted by some of the latter, and especially by Lord Carnarvon, as implying more than he intended them to imply. His last words in reference to Dean Mansel declared that 'his immeasurable superiority to me as a disputant deepens my conviction that the principle which I maintained against him was sound and true, one which even his ability and learning could not shake.' Colonel Maurice is undoubtedly justified in adding that this is 'something very different from admitting that in the particular dispute between them he was worsted in argument by his opponent. On the contrary, it is the assertion of a man who believes that he gained a dialectical advantage over his opponent because of the strength of his case, despite what he assumes to be his relative inferiority.'

We have not said anything, and we need not now say much, of another phase in Mr. Maurice's incessantly active and self-sacrificing life. In this phase we see him under different conditions; but the zeal with which he strove to make known the good news of God to all whom he could reach was of necessity shown in his efforts to improve the state of working men and to arrest the severance of classes which forty years ago threatened to become a serious national danger. He looked upon the one work as coming within the scope of his mission not less strictly than the other, and he never stopped for a moment to count the cost. He knew that he was placing himself in the van of a movement which would call forth vehement suspicion and dislike from those who thought only of the maintenance of privilege and

property. He knew that he might have to make use of, perhaps even to introduce, names or terms which would be regarded as evidence that he and they who were associated with him were seeking to overthrow the order of society and to let loose the blind force of an angry and ignorant mob. He knew also not merely that he might endanger his worldly position—a circumstance which would seem to him scarcely worth a passing thought—but that he might be accused of selfishly linking himself with sundry notorious men, and so of bringing discredit on a great public institution whose best interests he was pledged to further. Well aware that these and other difficulties might clog his path, he felt assured that this was precisely one of those matters in which he must leave it to God to make his way clear before his face. As to the immediate step to be taken he had no doubt, and he took it. His own hopes have been in great part verified, in some respects they have been realised in a measure far exceeding anything that he could have looked for, while the fears of those who regarded his action with alarm are practically forgotten. The principle of co-operation among workmen has long since received the sanction of law, and the controversies provoked by the assertion of it have died away. Summing up the results thus far attained, Colonel Maurice remarks that

‘there are now 660,000 heads of families, representing, it is said, a twelfth of the whole population of the kingdom, members of workingmen’s co-operative societies. The whole movement is avowedly Christian, orderly, loyal. It is steadily growing. As an illustration of its beneficial effects, it has been noticed that in those towns in which it is established distraining for small debts hardly exists. Strangely enough, our modern English historians, with all their interest in social movements, have devoted no word to this one.’

So great on the question of co-operative labour is the tranquillity of the present time with the excitement of the past that the interest of the subject now turns chiefly on the motives and conduct of the leaders, and among these leaders none carried greater weight with the rank and file of the movement than Mr. Maurice. From the first he was ready to go as far as he saw that he ought to go. Writing to Mr. Kingsley early in 1850, he trenchantly declares:—

‘Competition is put forth as a law of the universe. That is a lie. The time is come for us to declare that it is a lie by word and deed. I see no way but associating for work instead of for strikes. I do not say or think we feel that the relation of employer and employed is not a true relation. I do not determine that wages may not be a righteous

mode of expressing that relation. But at present it is clear that this relation is destroyed, that the payment of wages is nothing but a deception. We may restore the whole state of things; we may bring in a new one. God will decide that.' (Vol. ii. p. 32.)

To speak briefly, Mr. Maurice insisted from the first that in the order of society there was a sphere for the principle of individual ownership, and a sphere also for that of communism. The former was the sphere of the State, the latter that of the Church. This view is very clearly drawn out in a letter to Mr. Ludlow written in the summer of 1849, in which he says that, although he can exercise no direct influence on statesmen, he feels bound to give the Communist principle a fair trial.

'On the contrary, I am convinced that the obligations of clergymen in this respect are stronger, and their opportunities greater, than those of Sir George Grey and Lord John Russell. The State, I think, cannot be communist; never will be, never ought to be. It is by nature and law conservative of individual rights, individual possessions. To uphold them, it may be compelled (it must be) to recognise another principle than that of individual rights and property, but only by accident; only by going out of its own sphere, as it so rightly did in the case of the factory children. But the Church, I hold, is Communist in principle, conservative of property and of individual rights only by accident; bound to recognise them, but not as its own special work; not as the chief object of human society or existence. The union of Church and State, of bodies existing for opposite ends, each necessary to the other, is, it seems to me, precisely that which should accomplish the fusion of the principles of Communism and of property. . . . Those who, on High Church, Low Church, or Dissenting grounds, cry out for the abolition of this union, are working unconsciously towards one or other of these ends, or rather towards the most tremendous struggle of two opposing and, in their separation, equally destructive and godless principles. What I say is, to accomplish the best objects of those who desire this dissolution—to remove the fearful mischief which they rightly see follows from our present condition—we want the Church fully to understand her own foundation, fully to work out the communism which is implied in her existence. She has been for a long while looking upon herself merely as a witness for the principle of property, merely as a second State instituted to embody and protect it. So far as her outward position is concerned, this ignominious theory has involved all the degradation and State subserviency of which, on different grounds, Mr. Denison and Baptist Noel complain. But it has led to worse inward consequences of which they do *not* complain, but which they both in their different ways have been promoting; to a low view, I mean, of spiritual blessings, to a habit of regarding them as the property of an exclusive body, or of the individual elect; not as treasures like the light and air of which all may partake together.' (Vol. ii. p. 10.)

In avowing, therefore, the principle of what he termed Christian socialism, his great wish, in his son's words, was to Christianise socialism, not to Christian-socialise the universe. Hence, when, almost at the outset of the movement, a proposal was made for the setting up of a central board which should regulate the production and action of co-operative associations throughout the country, he contended that such a scheme could not fail to bring back and to intensify the evils against which the movement itself was a protest. The plan seemed to him a device for turning a number of warring forces, each seeking the other's destruction, into harmony by certain scientific arrangements concerning production and consumption; and here, as before, his answer was ready.

'I acknowledge in these warring creatures an element of peace and harmony, the work of God's Spirit. To that I speak in each of them. I can speak to nothing else. If the Son of peace be there, my peace will rest upon them; if not, it will return to me again.'

Nor did he fail to avail himself of the advantage given to him by political economists or others who insisted on the benefits of competition, while they complained that it had become or was becoming excessive. The admission seemed to him to give up the whole question.

'It is not then the law upon which trade or human life is to be regulated. Let it come in under whatever modifications . . . it must come in as a mere make-weight or additional stimulus to act upon men who are primarily moved by some quite different inspiration. If we can settle what that inspiration is, I have no fear that we shall allow competition more than its legitimate influence, or that it will claim it for itself. At present it boasts to be the one governing motive of human beings. Reason declares, the most painful experience proves, that if it does govern it is destructive of society, that it sets up every individual against his neighbour.'

That such a movement as this should excite alarm amongst men commonly spoken of as 'safe' was a matter of course. The alarm was soon excited in the minds of some who took part in the government of King's College, and was fully shared by the Principal. The fear on their side was that the whole scheme was unchristian, and that its end must be anarchy. The answer was that Mr. Maurice and his colleagues had tried to teach the working men in their words what they had tried to show them in acts, that Christianity is the only means of promoting their well-being and counter-acting the moral evils which lie at the root of their physical evils; that they had protested against the spirit of compe-

tition and rivalry precisely because they believed it was leading to anarchy and must destroy at last the property of the rich as well as the existence of the poor; and that, far from putting the Bible aside or depreciating its authority, they had insisted that, taken in its most simple literal sense, it declares God to be the present ruler of the world, and that 'if they have faith in Him and in His word, they will find 'a help and teacher in their daily perplexities, in their 'common life, which will save them from resorting to 'demagogues as ignorant as themselves.' The issue of the debate was clear. The council still regretted that an impression had been left on many minds which, if it were not removed, must do harm to King's College; but they admitted that the impression was not warranted by the character of Mr. Maurice's teaching in the College or by anything that he had published or said without its walls. The storm, dissipated for the moment, gathered again on the publication of his Theological Essays in the following year, and ended in his withdrawal from his professorship.

The readers of Mr. Maurice's life will not fail to see that, in whatever circumstances he might be placed and whatever office he might have to fill, there was one work, and virtually one work only, for him to do, and this was to convince himself and his fellowmen of the Divine kingdom as a present reality affecting them at every moment and in every concern of their lives. The intensity of this conviction, and the measure in which it pervaded all his thought, imparted to his writings, if not to his conversation, something of a monotonous character. It became easy to watch the process by which any given subject was brought round to the groove in which he could set forth the truths lying nearest to his heart. But, although among his hearers and readers some might become wearied with what they might term an excess of repetition, his sincerity and fearlessness in the discharge of his mission were not, and could never be, questioned. It might seem from time to time that, in spite of his protests against all notions which regarded religion as resting on an external authority, he rested it, after all, on such an authority himself. The readiness with which he could claim such a document as the Athanasian Creed as warranting exclusively his own mode of looking at it, tended to justify and to strengthen this suspicion. But they who care to look below the surface will assuredly see that in the final issue the truth of the message was to be determined by its source and not by the channels through which it had

passed or might pass; and this source was the Divine Word speaking always and bearing witness always to the same love. This love had redeemed the world, making all men the inheritors of a Divine kingdom, their title-deeds to which were sealed in baptism. He held that the Catechism of the Church of England declared this truth distinctly and unequivocally, but he was not prepared to abandon or to modify his conviction if on this point he should be proved to be mistaken. 'It is a point,' he urged, 'of infinite importance, and if the Catechism stand in the way of our acknowledging the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, concerning the state of men in the sight of God, the Catechism must go.'* In the path of duty such as this, and indeed of all duty, he knew neither hesitation nor fear. He was not a many-sided man. His sense of humour was not great, his appreciation of form and colour was positively feeble. At no time would he have given himself much trouble to look for either; at the age of forty he doubted whether Italy would for him have any charm, and confessed that the exertion of pleasure-hunting and beauty-hunting seemed to him rather more oppressive and fatiguing than any other. His mode of dealing with historical facts and the evidence for them was marked by peculiarities which we have already noticed, and his estimate of some great events of his own time was shaped by theories which will scarcely stand the test of scrutiny.

But when we turn to the qualities which made the man essentially what he was, we find ourselves in a charmed circle. These qualities had, indeed, something to do with the peculiarities which made his intellectual constitution 'a good deal of an enigma' to Mr. Gladstone; but Mr. Gladstone at the same time speaks of 'the picture of him as a Christian soul as one of the most searching, touching, and complete' that he had ever seen in print. 'The self-depreciation which in his writings sometimes irritated rather than attracted his opponents, assumed in private life the form of a personal courtesy, not without a tinge of humility, which was singularly captivating. His treatment of himself was severe, almost to austerity; his carefulness and tenderness for others were unbounded, and were shown in all the commonest circumstances of daily intercourse. Those who came near him found themselves in an atmosphere of purity, generosity, and self-sacrifice, which they

could scarcely fail to be the better for entering.* But in private life, as in public, he never shrank from the task of rebuking, when rebuke seemed to him called for; and this would be whenever anything was said or done which implied disbelief in the Divine government of the world or maintained principles in antagonism with the Divine law. 'There were some to whom he so spoke,' his son tells us, 'who never forgave him. The marvellous thing, considering the depth to which he sometimes cut, is that there were so few.' He lived, in short, and he died, emphatically a servant of God. He felt himself from the first charged with a mission as full, direct, and solemn as any that was ever entrusted to the prophets of the Hebrew Church; and his powers of body and mind were unstintingly and unflinchingly spent in the fulfilment of it. Whatever judgement some might pass on his words or his acts, he achieved a work not merely vast in its extent, but far-reaching in its consequences. He fought for the most part single-handed: he was certainly not supported by any school of partisans. But his influence, so far as it went, was exerted in opposition to the most powerful and attractive school of his day; and there can be but little doubt that, in arresting its progress and crippling its strength, his influence was stronger even than the influence of the Oxford party against the form of thought and belief which that party was seeking to supplant.

* We regret that Colonel Maurice should have felt himself called upon to set down some details illustrating his personal devoutness, which we find in pp. 285-554 of his second volume, and more particularly in p. 205 of vol. i. We say nothing as to the call which a man may or may not feel to spend a whole night in prayer; but we deprecate the haste which infers this from the fact that a bed shows no sign of having been slept in. There are some other points which we might note, but we content ourselves with saying that these are matters which are best treated *sub silentio*. The contents of all hagiologies consist to a very large extent of materials which ought never to be given to the world, and which never can be given without violation of seemliness and reverence. We do not believe that anything can be gained by these contributions in Mr. Maurice's Life towards furnishing matter for an Anglican hagiology.

ART. VIII.—*Johann Sebastian Bach : his Work and Influence on the Music of Germany, 1685–1750.* By PHILIP SPITTA. Translated from the German by CLARA BELL and J. A. FULLER-MAITLAND. 8vo. London: 1884.

THE whole history of Art, taking the word in its widest meaning, affords no spectacle more remarkable or, it may be added, more instructive from certain points of view, than that presented by the slow but progressive extension of the fame and influence of the works of Bach during the period which has elapsed since their earnest, studious, single-minded author passed away from among living men. Most of the small band of the greatest musical composers passed a portion at least of their lifetime amid the blaze of popular applause, and were crowned with laurels won in the face of an admiring concourse, and amid the heat and tumult of conflict. Bach alone presents the unusual phenomenon of a composer of great original genius, and of almost unparalleled mastery over the materials and conditions of his art, passing a quiet domestic life in diligent but unobtrusive study and production; apparently undisturbed by ambition, except the ambition to do as well as possible the work which he set himself to do, and to realise his own artistic ideal; producing with unwearied diligence compositions in which deep and earnest feeling is expressed through tonal construction of the most elaborate technical character; doing great things as a part of his daily business, hardly himself aware of their greatness; composing cantatas which are now of world-wide fame, for the prim religious ‘functions’ of congregations whose pastors and masters regarded him merely as the church organist, talented but self-willed and rather troublesome—a person to be called to order for his musical liberties in accompanying the psalmody; dying with the reputation, even among the initiated, of an organ-player and contrapuntist of unusual powers, ‘merely that and nothing more,’ and passing soon into an obscurity into which his works followed him. It is hardly possible to realise at this moment, when Bach is a name hallowed on all musical tongues, that there was half a century during which, not only in England (which never knew him till recently) but in his Fatherland, his name and his productions had passed nearly out of recognition. But wonderful is the innate vitality of a work of genius. Let no one who has produced a great poem, in whatever medium, despair of its surmounting all obstacles to fame short of the

actual destruction of its material embodiment. Let this vehicle of the Maker's thought be left intact, and sooner or later the thought will burst from its tomb. As Matthew Arnold says in his wonderful little poem, 'The New Age,' when the epoch has ended, and strife is stilled upon the plain, then

'O'er that wide plain, now wrapt in gloom,
Where many a splendour finds its tomb,
Many spent fumes and fallen nights,
The one or two immortal lights
Rise slowly up into the sky,
To shine there everlastingly
Like stars over the bounding hill.'

So it has fared with the genius of the man who was once Cantor of the Thomasschule at Leipzig, and wrote anthems for the church service and taught the little boys Latin.* Slowly the conviction of his greatness has broadened and deepened, till at the present moment he seems not so much a man as an influence; not a mere musical composer, but a kind of source and fount of musical achievement and inspiration.

The temporary obscuration of his star of course explains to some extent the scarcity of biographical notices of Bach till recently; Forkel's short and dry little book, published in 1802, which ignored the composer's vocal works almost entirely, having been the first attempt at a consecutive Life, and the only one of much importance till the appearance of Dr. Spitta's truly 'exhaustive' work, the greater portion of which has now been rendered accessible to general English readers by the translation to which the names of Miss Bell and Mr. Fuller-Maitland are appended. As to the translation, it is necessary merely to express grateful recognition of the labours of those who have gone patiently through the task of translating into English three portentously thick volumes of mostly very dry and laboured writing. Perhaps the translators have not quite succeeded in giving to their work that air and style of original writing which, if combined with accuracy of rendering, is the highest achievement of translation. There is a slightly cramped and foreign character about some of the sentences, very likely arising from the desire to be conscientiously accurate; but the work seems to have been done with great care. In repeatedly turning it over we have only noticed one obvious error, 'Mozart's Sym-

* This was a portion of the Cantor's official duty.

‘phony in C minor with the fugue,’ which should, of course, be ‘C major.’ But the book itself, as an example of biography, is a success rather in regard to quantity and presumable accuracy than literary quality. Dr. Spitta has aimed at doing what Jahn did in his admirable ‘Life of Mozart’ (unique among musical biographies)—at giving an insight into and a critical review of the music and musical life of the period in which the composer lived, and tracing the connexion between his art and the circumstances and influences under which it arose. Of course no biography of a great artist is really complete except on some such scheme as this; but Dr. Spitta has not the shaping power which alone can render such a biography in itself a work of literary art and a pleasure to the literary sense. The author gives us a great deal of information which is of interest in regard to early German music and the generation of musicians preceding Bach; but all that is of real value might have been compressed into a shorter space with much advantage to the book and to the reader, and might certainly have been arranged in a far more intelligible and coherent manner. But Dr. Spitta, in the language of an old proverb, ‘leaves nothing in his inkstand;’ he has amassed a great amount of information of a more or less vague character about the organists and church composers of the ante-Bach period, some of which refers to names of no interest now, and which is immensely spun out, and he can find it in his heart to bestow all his tediousness on the reader without even lightening the labours of the latter by lucid arrangement of the voluminous materials used. You never know where to have him; every few pages he is off on some fresh scent, and in many cases it requires careful comparison of opposite pages to find out whom he is talking about at any particular moment, and to unravel the intricacies of his personal pronouns. We read a paragraph, for instance, commencing ‘The appointment to Weimar was an auspicious circumstance,’ &c.; this is the first intimation to the reader that Bach had received such an appointment; there is a passing remark, a few pages previously, to the effect that he had applied for it, but nothing more. The first hint of the most important change in Bach’s official life, his appointment to the cantorship at Leipzig, is dragged in in the same kind of shambling and allusive manner, and then quitted for twenty pages for a criticism on the ‘*Wohltemperirte Klavier*.’ Biographical details and criticism are all jumbled together in almost inextricable confusion, and each chapter seems a labyrinth without either beginning, middle, or end. In short,

Dr. Spitta has shown immense diligence and enthusiasm in collecting facts, without any notion how to put them together or recount them in readable form. But there is, we think, another reason why, even under better literary management, a voluminous biography of Bach would not in any case have the interest which a really good biography of others of the great composers could not fail to have. In the first place, we are very poorly supplied with personal traits of the man, and all that Dr. Spitta gives us (which is probably all that will ever be available now) goes but a little way towards enabling us to realise his personality and manner. But it must be admitted, also, that however we may admire Bach's patriarchal domestic life of peaceful industry, and his apparent freedom from the 'last infirmity of noble minds,' it is, after all, the brilliant struggling life, passed in the great world and in open fight for fame, which furnishes the material of greatest interest for writers and readers of biography. Bach was a great genius and an evidently loveable man, but the personal traits of him are few, and those few are really not of much interest, except as they concern his art and his views in regard to it. As far as we can judge he was, apart from his music, a staid, quiet man with a certain degree of temper (more easily stirred by artistic than by social annoyances), and deficient in humour—a characteristic in which his biographer more than emulates him. Consequently the whole 'Life' has not so much the human and social interest of a biography as the artistic interest of an extended musical criticism, containing much that is valuable and suggestive, but withal prosy, diffuse, and ill-constructed, to an extent that makes the consecutive perusal of it a toil rather than a pleasure.

Bach the musician being then of so much more interest to us at present than the little we know or can know of Bach the man, we may confine our remarks mainly to the artistic side of the subject; only giving a glance in the first place at what is known of the composer's family history and antecedents, for this also bears to some extent upon his musical position. In almost all cases eminent composers have furnished practical arguments in favour of the theory of heredity; seldom has there been a musician of eminence who could not point to one or more musically gifted persons among his immediate progenitors; but in the case of Bach the hereditary descent of genius is so remarkably exemplified that he seems almost to stand as a typical instance of the truth of the doctrine referred to. Mr. Galton, the apostle of

hereditism, has not failed, if we remember right, to make special note of the instance of Bach and his relation to his multifarious ancestry. A member of a family who were known as more or less 'musical' a century and a half before his own musical career (which we may date roughly from 1700) commenced, the father in turn of a large family, nearly all of whom were, in his own words, 'born musicians,' some of whom obtained considerable eminence in their time, John Sebastian Bach seems to have been the central figure in which all this widely diffused and long-transmitted musical talent was summed up and brought to a head. The fact that no son at all equal to himself succeeded him, and that the musical ability of the family began slowly to decline after his generation, may perhaps suggest a rider to the theory of heredity, to the effect that a great effort of nature in this way seems to exhaust, or at least weaken, the brain-vitality of the stock, and the power of transmission. One of Bach's sons, Philip Emanuel (the 'English Bach'), was in his time imagined to be his father's equal, and even eclipsed the paternal fame; but *opinionum commenta delet dies*. Friedemann, the eldest son, may have had capacity to come nearer to his father, but the moral stamina seems to have been wanting. As late as 1846 there died A. W. Bach, a good writer for the organ, whose fine Prelude and Fugue in C minor is included in Mr. Best's interesting collection of 'Organ Pieces, Ancient and Modern.' But no one of the name has in any way approached the greatness of John Sebastian, who stands at the culminating point from which the family genius declines in each direction. The earliest hint of music in the direct line of the great composer is peculiarly interesting and characteristic. Dr. Spitta fixes the first common ancestor of the various branches as living probably about the middle of the fifteenth century, 'since in the sixteenth century the main stem had already thrown off vigorous branches in other directions.' They were a purely German family sprung from men of the soil, peasants in Thuringia; and the beginning of music in the branch whence Sebastian Bach sprang was, according to his own record, to be traced to Veit Bach, miller at Wechmar, who took his name from the patron saint of the church at Wechmar, thus pointing, as the author observes, 'to an intimate connexion of some duration with the affairs of the place.' Veit, says his descendant, had his greatest pleasure in a small cithara (*Cythrigen*), which he took into the mill with him, and played on it while the mill worked. 'He must at

‘any rate,’ comments Sebastian Bach, ‘have learned time in that way.’ This Veit was apparently, for the biographer does not seem quite clear about it, or else does not make his meaning clear, the great-great-grandfather of the composer. His son Hans showed (naturally) a taste for music, and was apprenticed to the town-musician at Gotha, another Bach, to become a *Spielman*. The master, Caspar Bach, ‘took Hans to live with him in the court of the old Guildhall, his official residence. The sounds of bustle and business came up from the stalls which occupied the whole of the market-place on the ground-floor, and from the gallery above he and his assistants must have piped out the *cho-rale* at certain hours according to long usage.’ Hans turned out a gay fellow, who played the fiddle at merry-makings. The eldest of his three sons, Johann, seems to have been the first who shadowed forth to some extent the kind of career which his great descendant was destined to follow. He settled at Erfurt, and was organist of the church known as the *Prediger-Kirch*.

‘As town musician and as organist he united in his own person both the branches from which at a subsequent period the music of Germany, in the hands of Sebastian Bach, developed its noblest blossoms—instrumental music, for secular purposes, and religious music. Though he took no direct part, as Cantor, in vocal church music, even this derived its chief power of becoming what it did under his great descendant from the developement of the art of organ-playing. His brothers and most of his children and successors preferred to cultivate only one or the other of these two branches (i.e. secular and sacred), until Sebastian once more mastered the whole domain of music, though, indeed, the posts he held did not always warrant this combination. Through a long period of calamity’ (arising from wars) ‘Johann Bach was the head of the Bach family of musicians. He lived to see it spread and thrive, and strike deep root beyond Erfurt, in Arnstadt and Eisenach. Henceforth began a constant and busy intercourse between these three towns. Where one prospered he drew others after him, and by inter-marriage and other family ties they further confirmed themselves in the feeling of a closely knit and patriarchal community of interests.’

It was thus that the connexion was established with Eisenach, where Sebastian Bach was subsequently born. We cannot linger over the genealogical details which are imbedded in the literary conglomerate of 180 pages which precedes the actual entrance of the hero on the scene; but matter of interest may be extracted from it. The strong family tendencies of the Bachs are illustrated in the incident, occurring more than once, of one brother in a family marrying the sister of the elder brother’s wife; ‘union is strength’ seems

to have been a principle practically acted upon, and by which, no doubt, the peculiar family individuality was kept up. The biographer is emphatic in regard to the 'native and pithy 'originality' of the whole Bach family: 'hardly one of the 'illustrious musicians it produced, including Sebastian and 'his generation, ever visited Italy for the developement of his 'talent or benefited by the instruction of a foreign master.' To this part of the question there are, as we shall have occasion to observe, two sides. But there is no doubt that the locality and circumstances among which the family originated tinged their whole family character for generations. The Thuringian land itself, to which the Bachs clung so tenaciously,

'exerted an influence over them in many ways. The loneliness of its woods and valleys--which still, even in these overwhelming times of ours, her--and there arouses a delightful feeling, as though the motley world had been left outside the mountains that hedge it in--whose charm could keep its hold even on the great soul of Goethe for more than fifty years: that spirit of solitude soared over the country with wider and rougher wings a century earlier. It narrowed the outlook and deepened the sources of inward life, the spring from which music, above all, derives its vitality. More particularly it tinged the peculiar religious spirit which speaks to us in the works of Christoph and Sebastian Bach.'

Of the truth and insight of this remark there can be no question. The religion of deep reverential feeling, unalloyed by elaborate ritual, breathes through the *chorale* music of Bach and his school, just as the social life of himself and his family, simple and unpretentious, seems only the continuation in a rather wider sphere of the peasant life and associations of his ancestors. The art widened and deepened, but the home-loving domestic spirit remained long unchanged, a testimony to the innate force of character of the race. Among all the traits of the family history that are mentioned, however, none seems to us more interesting than the brief notice of the earliest known musical Bach to which we referred; and we can never again hear the organ fugues or choruses of Sebastian Bach the Cantor, with their mighty waves of rocking and rushing sound, without travelling back in imagination to that little rill whence all this flood of music swelled--to that old-world scene of rustic art-culture where Veit Bach played upon his cithara to the accompaniment of the clatter of the village mill in the Thuringian forest.

The composer was immediately descended from the second

son of that Hans Bach before alluded to, named Christoph, who was born at the said village of Wechmar in 1613, followed the calling of a musician, in 1642 was member of the guild of musicians in Erfurt, and died at Arnstadt in 1661. His second and third sons were John Christoph and Ambrosius, who were twins, and said to have been so much alike that their own wives could hardly distinguish them apart. With John Christoph we have no concern here, save to mention that several pages of the biography are taken up with an account of a 'breach of promise case' in which he was concerned, of no interest and having no bearing on the subject of the biography; but Dr. Spitta never knows when to pass over anything. Ambrosius 'settled 'in Erfurt in 1667' is the first notice we find of him, and then, a number of pages further on, 'we left Ambrosius 'Bach at the time when he entered the Town Council of 'Erfurt,' of which matter nothing had been said when 'we 'left' him; but that is Dr. Spitta's way. It is vaguely indicated that he was a violin-player, and that violin-playing would be what Sebastian Bach would probably have chiefly heard in his father's house; a fact not without its bearing on the musical culture of the son's genius. In October 1671 he moved to Eisenach, where Sebastian, his youngest son, was born 'in all probability on March 21, 1685.' The boy's mother died when he was nine years old, and the father two years afterwards, and Sebastian was transferred to the care of his elder brother, John Christoph, who had previously been sent to Erfurt and appointed organist of the principal church of the town. If Sebastian may have derived his love of and skill upon the violin from his father, under his brother he had opportunities of becoming acquainted with the organ, the instrument with which his name is more particularly associated. The elder brother does not seem to have been of a cordial disposition, however, and Sebastian showed his own strength of character in his determination to study the works of the leading organists of the day, of which his brother had a collection which he kept under lock and key. The bookcase was covered with a wire lattice, and Sebastian succeeded in getting the roll through the meshes of the wire at night, and copying it by moonlight, a feat which occupied six months. This is one of the few incidents on record which throw direct light on Bach's character. It is painful to add that the brother, who seems to have been very unlike the Bachs generally, took the copy away from him when he discovered it. The pretext probably

was that the boy ought to be occupying himself with more elementary studies; but the incident is musically valuable, inasmuch as it proves that at a very early period of his life Bach became acquainted with the style and method of the leading organ composers of the day. At fifteen he was fairly crowded out of his brother's house, and thrown upon the world, obtaining a situation as chorister at Lüneberg, in the church of the Benedictine monks of St. Michael. It is somewhat singular to find a musician who was so peculiarly Lutheran commencing his professional career by assisting at a Catholic service. It is a matter of assumption rather than of proof that he soon made himself useful in other ways than singing, and became of some importance to the establishment. The Lüneberg convent appears to have aimed at a good deal in the musical way; 'on Sundays and 'holydays a motett at least was performed at morning 'service, and at afternoon service an *aria** with organ 'accompaniment,' and there was a good musical library attached to the church. But the fact is that Bach's school was wherever and whenever he could hear good music, especially good organ-playing. His genius was essentially and in the first place instrumental rather than vocal; and the instrument of his day, the great medium through which any man of exceptional powers as a composer made known his ideas, and on which players of exceptional ability displayed their executive powers, was the organ. To be sure, the display was in almost any case of something more than execution, for the custom of the day leaned towards extempore playing on the organ, a very different matter from merely executing music previously written. This may have sometimes led to people having to listen to rather mediocre music by players whose manual powers exceeded their mental, but it gave a double interest to the exhibition of the really eminent men who combined in themselves the functions both of composer and executant. The organ performances given in churches under these conditions were the musical excitements of the day; and as people now crowd to hear a piano recital from Bülow or Rubinstein, so

* Not to be confounded with the modern use of the term *aria*, an 'air' for a solo voice. The *aria* of Bach's day was usually a harmonised composition for several voices. An exquisite little movement so named occurs in one of Bach's motetts for a double choir; it is somewhat like a chorale in rather free and extended form, with more elaboration of melody than characterised the *chorale* or psalm tune proper.

they then crowded to the churches to hear the organ fantasias of Pachelbel, Buxtehude, and others whose names, if not perhaps harder than

‘Colkitto, or Macdonel, or Galasp,’

have a characteristic ring of the old German muse about them, rough and racy of the soil.

It is one of the meritorious points in Dr. Spitta’s book that he clearly sees the great and central importance of the organ in relation to the genius and works of Bach. The whole style of Bach, even in vocal writing, is derived from the organ, and the organ was, even before he appeared, in process of becoming the bridge from the ancient comparatively expressionless music of laboriously intertwined parts, to the modern music in which the arrangement of parts was subservient and secondary to the requirements of effect and expression. This view is expressed by the author in a passage which is essentially a very thoughtful piece of criticism, though certainly not very lucid in expression:—

‘The organ, with its echoing masses of chords produced by one man and progressing at his sole will and pleasure, was the most complete conceivable contrast to the ancient chorale music, that rich and complicated tangle of so many individual voices which could never altogether become mere instruments. This, more than anything else, brought about the transformation from the old polyphonic to the new harmonic system. It may perhaps seem strange to many readers, and yet it is quite natural, that even the best masters, between 1650 and 1700, showed a much more homophonic spirit, a much more independent treatment of the pure vocal parts, than is compatible with the pure organ style, according to our modern conception of it. Of course the rigid and heavy quality of the organ does not require for its highest idealisation mere external movement—as attained by runs and the spreading of chords, but an inner vitality from the creation of musical entities—for what else can we call melody and motive?—and by their intelligent reciprocity. But this is always a secondary, not, as in polyphonic vocal music, a primary consideration. We admire with justice the organic structure of an organ piece by Sebastian Bach, every smallest detail in it instinct with vital purpose; but the so-called polyphonic treatment, which clothes the firm harmonic structure, is but a beautiful drapery. It resembles a Gothic cathedral, with its groups of leaves that seem a spontaneous growth, and its capitals wreathed with flowers and leaves; they call up to our fancy the seeming of independent life, but they do not live; only the artist lives in them. This radical distinction cannot be sufficiently insisted on; without a comprehension of it the whole realm of organ music as an independent art, and all that has any connexion with it, including the whole of Sebastian Bach’s work, cannot be understood.’

If we may take upon us to express the author's meaning a little more clearly, it is this: that in the older polyphonic school of vocal writing, where the progress of each part was considered separately, and the result was a twining together of separate melodies, the total expression was only such as might arise from this blending of all the parts, and was not an innate and preconceived idea or intention on the part of the composer; while in such things as Bach's organ fugues, even when they appear as written in a certain definite number of parts (four or five as the case may be), the central idea or expression of the work is conceived apart from the part writing, which is merely Bach's way of casting or embodying the idea in musical form. The same remark would apply equally to Handel's choruses, and represents the real distinction between them and such music of the older school as that of Orlando Gibbons. With the latter part-writing is an end; with the former it is only a means.

The freeing of instrumental music from strict polyphonic form had been commenced, through the organ, a generation or two before Sebastian Bach came upon the scene. Of his uncle, Christoph Bach, the most talented of his predecessors in the family, we are told that he 'deliberately widened the 'breach' between the choral and the organ forms of music. In his works 'the progression of the parts is often quite untraceable; chords occur now in three parts and now in four, in obedience to purely harmonic requirements; only in a few cases can we discern which is intended for the pedal or the manual bass. . . . Everywhere the feeling is clearly predominant that the whole conduct of the piece lies in the 'hands of a single individual;' a condition the importance of which, in contrast with a form of music in which so many individuals have to wait upon each other, and none can enjoy any separate freedom of expression, can hardly be overrated. That is, in fact, what makes the essential greatness and interest of the organ. It is the only musical means whereby immense power and great variety of tone can all be placed under the controlling mind and hands of a single performer. And the manner in which this power began to be felt and taken advantage of is remarkably shown in the works of Buxtehude, some of which have been recently revived and republished, and who was the foremost player of the day when Bach was growing up into manhood. Buxtehude, who was a Dane, born in 1637, became eventually organist at the church of St. Mary at Lübeck, an office which he undertook along with the apparently obligatory condition of marrying

the daughter of the previous organist; a trait of the times not to be passed over. Buxtehude held *Abend-musiken*, which seem to have been regular church concerts, in the church, and paid great attention to getting up as complete a band as possible in those days; but his organ music is now of the chief interest to us, and is really an important link in the developement of instrumental music. The idea of a distinctive organ style was hardly invented then; his organ pieces have a licentious freedom, as of a *virtuoso* emancipated from the bonds of mere church music, and revelling in brilliant effects and feats of execution, in which, as Dr. Spitta happily remarks, 'we already hear the spirits of modern music hurtling against the door of their prison.' His best pieces are mostly fantasias, beginning with a prelude of brilliant scale passages or arpeggios, settling down into a more or less free fugue form, and usually concluding with a rattling *coda*, calculated to 'bring down the house.' In the peroration of one piece, in D major, he actually batters on the keyboard with rapidly repeated full chords with both hands, on the full organ, the pedal marking the principal accents; a mode of treatment which modern classical organ-players would scout as vulgar and inartistic beyond redemption, but which is interesting as showing that the organ performances of that day were no mere scientific studies for musical purists, but were intended as exciting displays for a general audience. One of Bach's youthful proofs of energy and interest in his art was his taking a long journey on foot to hear Buxtehude play and study his style, and the influence of the Danish player on Bach's early organ music is unmistakeable; his brilliant show-piece, the fugue in D major, with its pedal *cadenza*, is even written in obvious emulation of one particular work of Buxtehude's. But while in Bach's early organ music the licenses, and what we now consider the false æsthetic of Buxtehude's organ style, are imitated, these disappear from his later works, which represent a purely organ style confining all its effects within the proper limits of the instrument. The organ ceases, in fact, to be a general means of producing instrumental music, and operates within its own special realm. But we are anticipating a little. The other important and widely different musical influence of the day was the church chorale or psalm tune. It would be impossible to overrate the significance of the German psalm tune as a means both of musical influence and of musical and religious expression combined. Many of these grand and pathetic old melodies have the same national and impersonal character in musical,

as proverbs have in literary expression. They are the religious feeling of many and the musical expression of one; though their musical origin is in many cases untraceable. Unlike our variegated church hymnody, where we may hear in half a dozen churches as many different tunes set to the same hymn, the German chorale was wedded to its words and indissolubly associated with them. Throughout dark days of war or religious persecution its voice rose in confident faith or pathetic appeal; around it clustered the religious associations of generation after generation; it was sung in unisonal concert by whole congregations, prince and peasant together, 'the storm their high-built organs made' supplying the harmony; it was sung round the hearth in days of rejoicing or of sorrow in the family circle; it was the key-note of the sacred cantata; it was the theme of fugues for the organ; it was the bass or the *cantus* in preludes, sometimes treated with tender grace as an accompanied melody, sometimes made the bass to a counterpoint on the full organ, as in Krebs's prelude on 'O Ewigkeit, O Donnerwort,' where the heavy pedal notes seem almost to speak the very words in thunder. And the chorale was worthy, even musically, of its dignities. There are in many of the finest of these tunes a concentrated grandeur or pathos, and a breadth of what may be called elementary musical expression, which can hardly be paralleled elsewhere. To appreciate to the full the depth of meaning inherent in such a tune as 'Vater unser im Himmelreich' is almost the work of a lifetime, and ability to do so might be taken as a test of the existence of the highest and most earnest musical feeling.

The combined treatment of these two leading elements of the music of the day, of the chorale and of organ music in its various forms of prelude, fugue, sonata, or trio,* was the outward and ostensible work of a great portion of Bach's artistic life. He was, in fact, known and regarded mainly as a church organist, and the details of his earlier life in this capacity throw some interesting light on his character as man and artist, on which we may touch, without following out the merely historic side of the story, for which

* The *Trio*, in organ music of the German school, was a composition in three parts, for pedal and two separate manual keyboards, played by each hand; the two hand-parts were thus perfectly free to cross and recross each other with the same independence as two separate voices or two violins. The stops on the two keyboards were probably in general arranged so as to produce a distinctive contrast of tone.

we must refer the reader to the voluminous pages of the biography. Visiting Arnstadt at the age of eighteen, he played the organ at the New Church with such effect that he was at once adopted as organist in place of a predecessor of very commonplace talents, who had long given scant satisfaction, and who was shunted with little ceremony to make way for the young musician from Lüneberg. He was offered what was for those days a fair salary, and went through a solemn installation, receiving an exhortation to 'industry' and 'fidelity to his calling,' and to 'all that might become 'an honourable servant and organist before God, the worshipful authorities, and his superiors.' The organ, which was considered a fine one in its day, was in existence as late as 1863, when a new instrument was built in honour of Bach's memory, as many of the old stops as possible being retained in it. But the continuation of the narrative furnishes rather amusing illustration of the everlasting feud, in matters of church music, between the musician and the religious authorities. Bach, though eminently a church musician, was no pietist, and was not to be contented with mere religious spirit in the music unless the artistic spirit were there too. It was from Arnstadt that he made his journey to Lübeck to study Buxtehude, and in the fascination of this new opening in his musical experiences he was in no hurry to return to Arnstadt, and long outstayed his leave, being at length recalled by a citation from the Consistory of the New Church, who required him not only to account for his absence, but to answer for his eccentricities in accompanying the psalm tunes. His excuse for the absence was that he had gone to Lübeck to learn things connected with his art; but the accusation about the method of accompanying must have been difficult to answer to the satisfaction of himself and his interrogators. The biographer gives in full the curious report of the Consistory, preserved in the archives of the Principality of Sondershausen, under the title 'John S. Bach, organist of the 'New Church, summoned respecting his prolonged absence 'and the discontinuance of the part singing; 1706.' The paragraph about the musical question runs:—

'*Nos*' [the Consistory: the report takes the form of question and answer between *Nos* and *Ille*] 'charge him with having been in the habit of making surprising *variationes* in the chorales, and intermixing divers strange sounds, so that thereby the congregation were confounded. If in the future he wishes to introduce some *Tonus Pere-*

grinus,* he must keep to it, and not go off directly to something else, or, as he had hitherto done, play quite a *tonum contrarium*. And then it is very strange that up to this time he has had no "music making" (i.e. rehearsals) by reason of his not being able to agree with the scholars. Therefore he is to declare whether he will play both part-music and chorales with the scholars; since another Capellmeister cannot be kept, and if he will not do this, let him say so categorically of his own accord, that a change may be made, and some one who will undertake it may be appointed to the post.

Ille. If a proper Director be appointed, he will play again.

Resoluitur: That he shall explain his conduct within eight days, and at the same time that scholar Rambach appear, and be reproved for the *désordres* which up to this time have taken place between the scholars and the organist in the New Church.

Ille (i.e. Rambach). The organist, Bach, used to play too long preludes, but after this was notified to him by the Herr Superintendent, he went at once to the opposite extreme and has made them too short.'

Irritable genus musicorum! The obvious fact was that Bach could not restrain himself from indulging his fancy in harmonising the chorale melodies in various ways as he went on, playing musical experiments with them, quite intelligible to himself, and, perhaps, quite compatible with devotion on his own part, but bewildering to the less-enlightened congregation, who naturally regarded this as a wanton hindering of their worship. We could cap that with a modern anecdote of a very distinguished church musician (now dead) who, in accompanying a great concourse of people in singing the Hundredth Psalm, chose to play an interlude after each verse landing them a semitone higher in the scale for the next verse, to their great discomfiture when they found themselves, at the 'Doxology,' singing the tune a major third higher than they had commenced it. The significance of the story in regard to Bach lies in its indication how completely he carried the spirit of the artist into his sober work of a Lutheran church-organist. It is true that he unquestionably failed in his obvious everyday duty of drilling the stupid and intractable choristers, but this kind of stiffneckedness seems only to have belonged to his younger days, and was natural enough to a young genius conscious of his powers and feeling the whole realm of musical art before him to be conquered: in his mature years he cheerfully accepted the more prosaic duties incident to his post at

* 'Tonus Peregrinus,' it may be observed, is a name applied to one of the Gregorian tones; but here it evidently means modulating into a foreign key, so far at least as the worthy elders knew what they meant at all.

Leipzig, but for the present it was months before he answered the Consistory or put himself into the harness they had engaged him to work in, and in the interim he had also to answer to a charge of having brought a 'stranger maiden' into the church to 'make music' there—not at the service, for in that women took no part; boy choristers were *de rigueur*, as in a Catholic church—but on some other occasion. This, however, seems to have been in the way of legitimate courtship, as he married his cousin, Maria Barbara Bach, from Darmstadt, shortly afterwards, and probably had found that little musical *symposia* with the fair singer in the organ-loft at occasional times, he playing and she singing, formed no bad prelude to a more permanent engagement. Not only the artist and lover, however, but the craftsman comes before us in the records of Bach's early church-organist life. He knew all about the technical build of the 'huge house of the sounds,' and his thoroughly practical specification for the repairs and improvement of the organ at his next post, the Blasius-Kirche, at Mühlhausen, which is given in full, is very interesting as well in its provisions as in its downright and dictatorial tone, as of a man who knew thoroughly what he was about and would have no scamping. Unfortunately, even musical readers in England know generally so little of the mysteries of the organ that we must fear that quotation from this document would not be appreciated here; but it may be mentioned, as showing how little inclined was Bach at this time to anything like the asceticism of the modern purists on the organ, that he not only gives special directions about the repair of the 'tremulant' so that it may be regular in its pulsations, but that he added to the pedal a new 'Glockenspiel,' or scale of bells, played by the pedal keys. What would be said to this in a modern church organ? There is a Glockenspiel stop on the Crystal Palace organ, and when the first organ-player of the day presumed to introduce this at the last Handel Festival, in a particularly bell-like passage in Handel's First Concerto, we remember how the critics came down upon him. Bach's former organ at Lüneberg had a 'Cymbelstern' also, a contrivance for striking cymbals in the organ, probably by a special pedal.* Whether these additions are really in

* A London builder had an organ in the Exhibition of 1862 containing cymbals, a drum, and a triangle, actuated by various pedals. It was a good deal laughed at at the time; and certainly there is no need now to make an organ do what a modern band can do so much better.

keeping with the genius of the instrument, and whether Bach himself in his older period of more serious organ-composition, would have cared as much about them, of course may be questions to be asked; but the fact is interesting as showing that organ concerts in the good old days were by no means the sedate and solemn affairs that they are often supposed to have been.

But space, that *peau de chagrin* of the reviewer, which keeps shrinking in before his eyes as his subject grows in interest, warns us that we must here quit the historical method for what is the main object of this article, the attempt at some little critical analysis of the æsthetic elements in the stupendous mass of compositions which Bach has left. We use the epithet as much in regard to quality as quantity; the absolute quantity of his work is very great, but it seems overwhelmingly so when we consider what is the character of most of it; that it represents a degree of technical and constructive elaboration such as is only to be matched in the most serious and highly wrought works of Mozart, and that it is nearly all written in the most serious artistic spirit and wrought up to the highest finish. The amount and the quality of his music show indubitably that, however it may seem in one sense to be more laboured and less spontaneous than that of other great composers, it is in reality that of one to whom the feats were easy that are difficult to others, and who could express his feelings through the most involved and intricate problems of musical construction as fluently as Rossini could write *scenas* or Strauss produce waltzes. Whether this elaborately built-up music is calculated to satisfy all the longing of the soul athirst for emotional expression; whether it is not in some of its developements rather matter for curious study than for unfettered enjoyment, is a question of some interest, and the more so when we consider the remarkable set which has been made in the direction of a Bach-culture of late, and the almost unadulterated worship which his biographer offers at the Bach shrine. In regard to the latter, biographers have privileges, and it is certain that only an almost unlimited enthusiasm for his subject could induce anyone to go through the arduous labour which Dr. Spitta must have gone through in laying the foundations of and then writing this enormous biography. As to the former there can be little doubt that even among musicians there is just now a certain rather exaggerated reaction towards Bach, following naturally upon long neglect; that among many of

the general musical public who profess a devout faith on the subject there is little ability to render a reason ; and that a great many persons at present ' talk Bach ' with only a very vague idea as to what are his really great qualities, his shortcomings (for these exist), or his place and influence in reference to the art of music generally.

The works which most especially represent the basis out of which Bach's organ-music grew up, the organ compositions founded on chorales or hymn tunes, are still an absolutely dead letter in this country to all but a very few organ-players. They are scarcely ever played in churches, which would seem their most fitting arena ; they do not suit our present ideas or associations in regard to devotional music, and comparatively few English church-organs possess the quality of tone and the weight and power on the pedal organ which are necessary to give the effect intended by the composer.* If an organist of very classical tastes introduces one of these compositions in the course of a recital on a large concert-organ, it is listened to with bewilderment by most of the audience, as something quite out of the circle of their musical sympathies. And so it actually is. It is the musical expression of a religious form and feeling out of keeping with the religious cultus of modern England. To enter into it one must be to some extent in an archæological frame of mind, as Mendelssohn, the devout student of Bach, must have been when he brought out, during his stay in England, his edition of this class of Bach's compositions, which must now be looked for in second-hand music-shops and book-stalls. Certain of the larger of these works, no doubt, are of perennial interest to those who can hear with the understanding. The one on ' *Schmücke dich, o liebe Seele,*' with

* In regard to the instrument, the main distinction is this: the modern English church-organ is generally too brilliant and not sufficiently full in tone for giving the broad yet quiescent expression required for this music ; the pipes are blown with a heavier pressure of wind than formerly, producing more *noise* but less *tone* ; and the pedal organ is generally quite insignificant in comparison with that of the organs on which Bach played. Many of the smaller church-organs of his day in Germany had a power on the pedal organ which with us is considered quite unnecessary except for much larger and more costly instruments. Consequently, one of the favourite devices of Bach and his school, of keeping an independent composition progressing on the manuals, while the pedal at intervals thunders out the chorale, line by line, as a bass to the whole, cannot be rendered in our churches, or must be a failure if attempted.

its exquisitely finished accompaniment, wandering dreamily about in continuous flow (as Schumann beautifully said, 'twining golden garlands' about the principal melody); the 'Nun danket Alle Gott,' where the counterpoint so cunningly fashions itself on the lines of the hymn melody; the 'O Lamm Gottes unschuldig,' in three verses, closing with the melody in the bass, and accompanied by a pompous counterpoint figure in triplets (quite out of keeping, by the way, with the feeling of the hymn): these and some others should be known to all who take their pleasure in music seriously. But a large proportion of the collection must now be regarded in the light of archaic fragments of an extinct form of art, historically and constructively of great interest, but from which the breath of life has departed. It is far otherwise, however, when we come to the great organ compositions which, though originally composed for and played in churches, are in fact concert-pieces (the church being also the concert-room with Lutheran organists), designed to display all the powers of the instrument and all the musical and executive abilities of the composer. The latter, the executive element, must not be left out of account. There is abundant evidence (some of it known before, some of it new in the present biography) that Bach attached great importance to executive power; that he had a great repute on this account, especially for his remarkable execution on the pedals*—*bravura* playing, it might be called, considering the probably cumbersome keyboard and mechanism of the pedal of those days—and that he was particularly proud of this himself. He entered the lists with the other famous players of the day, and beat them all out of the field. Now, this is a very significant fact if we take it in connexion with the fact that in organ music alone the work of Bach retains entirely its position as the leading music for the instrument it was written for, unsuperseded by any more modern composition of the same class. His Chacones and other pieces for the violin, effective and astonishing as they are (though not always beautiful) when played by the few violinists able to master their technical difficulties, are no longer typical violin music. His 'Wohltemperirte Klavier' is an immortal work on its own basis, but it no longer represents the most characteristic and typical form of pianoforte music. When a great violinist is to do his best on a great

* It was said of him that he could play as rapidly and brilliantly with his feet as ordinary players could with their hands.

occasion, he probably selects Beethoven's Violin Concerto. When a new and ambitious pianist wishes to win his spurs, he desires to show what he can do with the E flat Concerto or one of the later sonatas of Beethoven. But when an organ-player is fired with the same ambition, he finds nothing since Bach which can equally display his power over the true capabilities of the instrument. When M. Saint-Saëns, one of the most modern in sympathies among French musicians, desired to display his powers as an organist to the London Philharmonic audience, he selected Bach's Prelude and Fugue in A minor; nor could any more crucial test have been found. The only organ-works that can be named since those of Bach are Mendelssohn's Sonatas and Fugues, very fine and interesting, and containing some distinctly new ideas in the treatment of the instrument, but not comparable to the works of Bach even in effectiveness, putting musical power out of the question. Surely this is a fact very significant, in regard to the question of the attitude of the artist to the world around him, of the influences under which the most living art is produced. Everything else that Bach did was more or less done to himself alone and to his own artistic satisfaction. In organ playing and organ composition alone he came in direct contact with the world of his day, and entered into public competition with his contemporaries on their own ground. Hence the still modern interest of his organ compositions; hence too, what is quite incontrovertible, his superior brilliancy and variety in this class of compositions as compared with those which were not written directly for the public ear of his day. Beautiful as is the spectacle of the quiet domestic student of art pursuing his course for love of art alone, it is after all in the larger light of life, in the stress of conflict for place and fame, that the works are produced which have the brightest, the most intense, the most varied and lasting interest for the world at large.

That these organ-works of Bach do not take public place at present by the side of Beethoven's sonatas for the piano is chiefly owing to the way in which the organ has dropped out of fashion—partly from the size, cost, and immobility of the instrument, which renders the private cultivation of a knowledge of organ-music impossible, except for very wealthy amateurs (for the things called chamber-organs are mere 'boxes of whistles,' giving none of the great character of the instrument), and the fact that our principal and most frequented classical concert-rooms do not contain adequate instruments; consequently our classical audiences know only

two or three of these great works which certain pianists take the liberty of playing on the piano, with a result which, to those who know their effect on the original instrument, is simply absurd. Dr. Spitta's judgement that these are the only instrumental works which can be paralleled, in perfection of form and power of expression, with those of Beethoven, is not overstating the case. The Toccata in F, the great fugues in G minor and A minor, the prelude and fugue in B minor, that 'in the Doric mode,' and others, belong to those few works of the highest realm of art, in which the form is a perfectly rounded whole, and in which not a detail can be altered or omitted without detracting from the perfect balance of the work. Nor are some of these (like the chorale compositions) dependent on great size and power in the instrument for their effect; their grandeur is spiritual, not material. Mendelssohn observes in one of his letters, about his playing the Toccata in F to himself on a small organ in a village church: 'The modulations at the close sounded as if 'they would bring the church down;' and the G minor fugue fascinates any competent listener, even when played on a very ordinary organ. Dr. Spitta's criticisms on these works are, however, capricious and unsound. He selects the *bravura* prelude and fugue in D (the one we have alluded to as written in emulation of a show-piece of Buxtehude's), as 'one of the most dazzlingly beautiful of all the master's organ-works.' The prelude contains splendid passages; but as to the fugue, we prefer the criticism we once heard from an old cathedral organist, 'Ah! Bach was young when he did that.' Dr. Spitta recognises the importance of the small prelude and fugue in E minor, one of the most pathetic little pieces of music ever written, and wonderfully modern in feeling. But we should recommend those who wish to form a critical idea of these works to take the biographer's reflections thereon *cum grano*. Before quitting the subject, a word may be said as to the few indications which exist in regard to Bach's method of playing his own organ-music. What little evidence there is goes entirely against the too common theory and practice of the purists of modern organ-playing, that these are pieces to be solemnly and religiously pounded through without any attempt at variation or contrast of effect; a method (or absence of method) which has probably done much to foster the popular notion of the special dullness of organ fugues. From hints in his organ-specifications, it is obvious that Bach was constantly on the look-out for new, striking, and even what might be called *bizarre* effects, and

that if he had lived in the present day he would have availed himself of every means furnished by modern mechanism for increasing the variety of effect and contrast in his organ music. Several indications occur also, that he was noted for the rapidity with which he played his own compositions—those of the more brilliant order of course. An internal testimony to this occurs in the A minor fugue, the subject of which, if played fast, would present a difficult position in the pedal part, upon the old cumbersome wide-spaced keyboards. Accordingly, wherever the theme enters on the pedal, it is slightly simplified, by the omission of one note, to get rid of this impediment to speed. This bit of evidence is conclusive against the ‘Goodman Dull’ of modern organ-playing, who robs Bach’s compositions of all their rightful claim to brilliancy, spirit, and *élan*.

Next to the organ fugues the ‘*Wohltemperirte Klavier*,’ more commonly known in England as the ‘Forty-eight ‘Preludes and Fugues,’ is unquestionably the most important, though it does not present that degree of brilliancy of musical effect which characterises the organ works. Here, again, our theory holds good as to the important effect of publicity on the artist; for this was a work written not for the public ear, but for the private study of the master’s more advanced pupils. The book consisted originally only of the first twenty-four pieces, to which alone the characteristic title was at first applied, implying that the clavier must be tuned on ‘equal temperament’ principles, so that all keys could be used upon it with the same effect; for one of the points in which Bach was in advance of his day was in his insistence on this principle of tuning keyed instruments, in opposition to the old system of unequal temperament, in which the false tuning, unavoidable (for reasons we cannot go into in detail here) on instruments with fixed tones, was all thrown into keys which were supposed to be less used than the others, instead of being divided equally among all the keys. This very controversy, again, is an instance of the predominating effect of the organ over the course of musical art in Bach’s time, since it is especially on the organ, with its sustained sounds, that these imperfections of tuning become disagreeably felt; and on the ‘unequal’ system such keys as A flat become on the organ almost unbearable in their falsity, the note which has to do double duty as either A flat or G sharp being tuned to an almost correct G sharp, leaving the third between A flat and C, in the key of A flat, so stilted and harsh as to be an absolute deformity to the ear. This work,

then, to illustrate practically the fact that all keys are equally required by the true musician, was also designed to afford to Bach's more advanced pupils the opportunity or necessity of becoming equally at home in the reading and fingering of every key; and either from its practical success as a means of education, or from the composer's interest in the experiment, it was followed up by a second set of twenty-four similar compositions, again ranging through all the keys, the two sets together making now the complete volume known as 'The Forty-Eight.' This, then, was a series of pieces written simply as lessons, with apparently no thought of publication, and, probably, little idea on the part of the composer that he was producing a work which was to be a model and study for musicians at all future times, and one of the special delights of all the great composers who succeeded him. Yet we find, even after all the great changes and apparent advance in the mechanism of pianoforte playing in modern days, great pianists still declaring that no such training for the mastery of the keyboard, from the student's point of view, is furnished by any one work. The testimony has come from those whose art apparently ran in the most widely different grooves: from such players as Thalberg, who, though he had not the depth of artistic seriousness to appreciate the musical worth and expression of these compositions, declared that he knew no study like them for forming a player; from Chopin, whose preparation for the playing of his own works in public was, as noted in a former article in these pages, to shut himself up and play Bach's fugues. But even this technical importance is secondary to the musical interest of a great part of the work. In this respect certainly it varies; it has its dry and matter-of-fact pages, with something of the *rococo* element, though these are not many. But it is a most wonderful example of the distinction, which has been hinted at above in reference to a critical remark of Spitta's about the organ fugues, between composing original music, original motives and melodies and expression, in a certain form, and the mere elaboration of the form for the form's sake. Bach has stamped the fugue form with his imprimatur, and many poor, dry, uninteresting fugues have been written because he wrote so many fine and interesting ones; the minor prophets thinking to prophesy merely by putting on, in a ritual fashion, the mantle of the great prophet. But, in fact, a large proportion of these exercises of Bach's are so many musical poems, grave and gay, full of variety of detail and

expression, having no greater likeness or repetition than in the fact that they are all subject to the same general and controlling form. To say that they are as various in expression as Beethoven's pianoforte works would be an exaggeration : they are too strictly confined within the limit of one adopted form for that ; but it may be said that no composer has ever been so various within such strict boundaries. The whole work has an important bearing on the philosophy of music in two senses. It shows us how much play of imagination is possible in art, even under the conditions of a highly-conventionalised form ; reminding us that all art is, after all, convention, and that the question is only of the logical observance of the degree of convention adopted. But the finest portions illustrate also most remarkably the distinction between intellectual grandeur of spirit and mere physical grandeur of sound in music. The most serious and pathetic of the fugues are types of the parallelism existing between musical expression and human thought ; the themes, in their special forms, exhibit the expression of feeling by differences of pitch, reduced to artistic form ; while the working out of the subject in harmony and counterpoint is the reflection in music of what logic is in thought ; it is, in fact, a form of logic, for what renders the progression of parts and harmonies interesting to us is their relation to a harmonic law, and the perception which we have of the constructive power displayed in marshalling these various voices of the fugue so that they shall appear to move quite freely, while always preserving a logical harmonic relation to each other—

‘most regular, when most
Irregular they seem.’

But the appeal in music of this class is to the intellect rather than to the mere physical or nervous pleasure of the ear. Dr. Spitta selects for special mention one example, the fugue in C sharp minor in the first set, which he justly describes as ‘one of the grandest creations in the whole ‘realm of clavier music ;’ which, as he says, expands at the close ‘into a composition of such vast breadth and sublimity, ‘of such stupendous, almost overwhelming harmonic power, ‘that Bach himself has created but few to equal it.’ To our fancy this wonderful fugue seems like the musical reflection of some great appeal in oratory, commencing with the almost cold, unimpassioned statement of the case ; gradually crowding argument upon argument, apostrophe upon apostrophe, till in the fervour of passion logic itself

risers into rhetoric, and we are swept along to the climax by a torrent of burning words. And for what was Bach content to write this sublime composition? For the old 'clavier,' an instrument weaker in tone and volume than an ordinary cottage piano of the present day! Truly there could be no more notable instance that greatness in music is inherent in the music itself, and not in the medium employed to produce it.

At present, in London at all events, Bach's choral music, as represented in three or four of his greatest works, is more familiarly known than his instrumental music. It is not many years since the 'B minor Mass' and 'The Passion' were to English amateurs no more than mystic names of works believed to exist, but of unheard-of difficulty and ponderosity, and outside of the range of musical possibilities. Now it has become the fashion to do the Matthew Passion whenever it can be managed, especially during Lent; the B minor Mass is to be heard at intervals, the Christmas Oratorio more frequently; and the Motetts, the separate parts of which Mozart on one occasion arranged round him on chairs and on the floor for study, in the absence of a score, have been made vocal by the Leslie Choir and the Bach Choir. In regard to these latter we may observe in passing, that Dr. Spitta strongly condemns the theory that they are to be regarded or performed as unaccompanied vocal music; he insists that they were intended to be accompanied on the organ, not only from internal evidence but from what he states as ascertainable historic fact, that they were usually preceded by an organ prelude, in which case it certainly cannot be supposed that the organ was dropped as soon as the voices commenced. We draw attention to this point for the consideration of the conductors of choral societies.

Of those greater choral works which have now emerged from their obscurity and become portions of the events of our musical year, it is very difficult to speak in a few words, so important are the questions in regard to music and musical expression which their form and feeling suggest. In regard to the enthusiastic admiration which the Mass in B minor excited when first made practically known to us through the admirable efforts of the Bach Choir, something must of course be allowed for the feeling of intense interest and excitement which always centres round what may be called a revival of anything great in art which has lain forgotten or unrecognised during previous generations. Various

influences combine to render a Renaissance always a time of exaggerated estimates; the novelty of the discovery, which gives keener zest to our enjoyment, combines with a feeling of self-appreciation that we, we alone, were the generation reserved to unearth and to do justice to the long-hidden treasure. Making all allowance for these special influences, it must be said that the B minor Mass, as a choral work and taken apart from the solos, justifies the feeling which was aroused and expressed when its long silence was broken and it became an audible experience to the ears of this generation of hearers. The weight and momentum of the choruses, and the intense fervour of their style, impressed one with an idea of colossal power and deep earnestness of purpose such as no other choral work in existence conveys in the same degree. That there is a certain want of relief, of light and shade, in the work as a whole, probably must also be felt even by some of those who are unwilling to acknowledge it to themselves; it must be felt also that there is no expression in it of the peculiar aspiration mingled with tenderness which has been the charm, to many ardent souls, of Catholic devotion and Catholic ritual: the words are those of the Mass, of the *magnum mysterium*, but the music is that of the Lutheran organist.

Thus in the contemplation of the composer's greatest work, we are at once brought face to face with the fact that Bach had no dramatising instinct, none of the power of going out of himself and becoming the mouthpiece of this and that phase of human feeling, of touching the various chords of the wild and eager human heart, which gives such multiple and ever-changing interest to the works of Handel and Beethoven. It may be said that he intentionally grasped at the experiment of adopting to the text of the Mass the musical spirit of Lutheranism; but the critical comparison of his choral works generally leads to the conclusion that his range of choral expression was restricted, though both grand and impassioned within its own limits. If we take the choruses in various works—the 'Christmas Oratorio,' the 'Magnificat,' and the various Cantatas—we find ourselves in the presence of a mass of fine powerful part-writing, but we seem to meet a great deal of the same expression and effect in each composition; the subjects of the choruses do, indeed, all differ, but they have not that sharp distinction, that marked individuality, which causes each one of Handel's principal choruses to retain its separate hold on the ear of the memory as a distinct expression of

feeling. The great choruses of the St. Matthew Passion are filled with more of the fire of inspiration, more of dramatic character, than those of any other of Bach's works: the sublime lamentation for three choruses, which opens the work; the thunder and lightning chorus, and the tender and pathetic dirge at the close—these are indeed great pieces of musical expression, in which we can forget the elaborate construction in sympathy with the deep feeling of the music. But it is not often that Bach allows us thus to forget the musical craftsman in his choruses, and hear only the musical poet. And if we are to consider it to be the true office of music not so much to astonish the intellect of the hearer, as to touch his heart or quicken his imagination, we can hardly regard Bach's choral works as of equal value with those wonderfully varied utterances of the other great master, who could give to the Christian Hallelujah and the pagan hymn of revelry, to the voluptuous serenade or the chorus of drinking soldiery, to the song of triumph of the Hebrews over their oppressors, or the dance before Ammon's god 'about the furnace blue,' each its complete and perfectly distinct dramatic expression.

But when we come from choruses to writing for solo voices, all excuse for comparison between Bach and his great contemporary disappears. He is simply nowhere, as a song-writer, in comparison with Handel; and one reason for this, apart from actual temperament and genius, is to be found in that very quality which Dr. Spitta refers to, as above-mentioned, as the 'native and pithy originality' of the Bach family, which showed itself partly in their neglect of any foreign musical culture. Neither Sebastian Bach nor any of his tribe ever thought it necessary to go to Italy to supplement their home studies; and Dr. Spitta evidently rather approves of this omission, as in favour of the retention of a pure and unadulterated national style. This notion of a national style is one of the fallacies of criticism. For what does it really imply? An essentially national style means shortcoming, not fullness. It means that a composer has remained bound, through want of more extended study, to the special idiosyncrasies of the art of his own country. The fact is, that some study of vocal music in Italy was exactly what Bach needed, and what Handel benefitted immensely from. Born in a country where vocal music and vocal execution have never been so well understood as instrumental, and with a style derived entirely in the first instance from instrumental music, Bach never acquired the faculty of writing pure and

spontaneous melodies in a purely vocal style. There are not more than one or two airs by him, exceptional among his vocal solos, which fix themselves in the ear and heart, as so many of the songs of Handel and Mozart do. Their style is mannered to a degree, and the manner is not a good one, from a vocal point of view; for it is obviously derived from the organ and harpsichord style of ornament and expression. In those keyed instruments, which were incapable of any expression from diminishing or swelling, or in any way modulating the force of a sustained note (for the contrivance called the 'swell' in a modern organ had no existence then), special expression was sought for by breaking up a note into a group of little detached notes, in the shape of trills and twitterings; and this unsatisfactory and often unmeaning method, arising out of the effort to make organ and harpsichord express what they were unfitted to express, is duly transferred by Bach to his vocal solos, which are full of this aimless twittering, to the exclusion of the nobler and more expressive forms of pure and flowing vocal melody. In studying this portion of Bach's music, in fact, one cannot help thinking of Veit Bach and his cithara, and detecting the lingering trace of rusticity, of *bourgeois* feeling, in the work of his great descendant. There is a want of elevation of feeling, of dignity of style, in his songs. There is not one example to be found of such dignified, and, if one may use the expression, high-minded pathos as we find in such airs as 'Return, O God,' and 'Ye sons of Israel,' in 'Samson.' Bach's pathos, in his songs of prayer and repentance, is of a weak, sentimental, sometimes; we might even say, of a querulous order. In his songs taken *en masse*, we recognise no doubt a seriousness of intention, and a carefulness of finish in the style adopted, more equable than that which pervaded the songs of Handel, who frequently threw himself away, and wrote *currente calamo* for this or that singer. But if there is a more general level maintained, it is a much more dead level. We seem to come to the same kind of passages over and over again; the melodies want distinctive character and unity; the constant use of the minor seventh of the scale becomes at last an almost irritating mannerism. The accompaniments are, no doubt, much fuller and more elaborate in design than those of Handel, almost invariably presenting a different and contrasting design from that of the voice part, or forming a counterpoint to it. But we can seldom get rid of the feeling of a want of buoyancy in the music, as if its wings were clogged. The accompaniments are scientifically

interesting, musically complete, but where is there anything like the fire and picturesqueness of that wonderful accompaniment to 'Thou shalt break them,' in the 'Messiah,' not to mention others? Anyone who could seriously regard the songs in the 'Passion' or the 'Christmas Oratorio' as comparable to those in the 'Messiah' and other oratorios of Handel's, must have taken leave of his critical faculty, or never come into it.

The comparison between the two great contemporary composers is almost inevitable; and Dr. Spitta himself furnishes the excuse for it, if any be needed, for he frequently touches on the subject, more especially in one very characteristic passage which is worth quoting. Handel, he observes,

'with a genius which, if more comprehensive, was far less profoundly laborious, never stood in so intimate a connexion with the organ music of his time, that essentially German branch of his art; and the way in which he afterwards made it subserve his grand and pregnant artistic ideal, the oratorio, demanded not so much profound treatment as breadth and brilliancy. The outward circumstances answer to this. Handel arrives at Hamburg in the bright midsummer days, in the gay society of Mattheson, and in obedience to an invitation from the President of the Council; he enjoys an affable welcome and festivities in his honour. Bach comes on foot in the dull autumn weather from Thuringia, following his own instinct, and perhaps not knowing one single soul that might look for his arriving.'

This contrast certainly typifies, curiously enough, the contrast between their genius and their work in the field of art. The one was the strong and successful man, living before the world---

'The very child of over-joyousness,'

taking all life as his province; the other was the sober, conscientious, and laborious student, working for his own ideal alone, in a more restrained though more complete method. But, however we may feel more reverence, in a sense, for the latter, is not art mainly for the joy of life, and is it not the strong and joyous poet, seeing, like Shakespeare, all sides of human feeling, who gives the greater gift to the world?

To sum up: it may be said that a comprehensive and impartial survey of Bach's genius and works favours the conclusion that the old view of him, as essentially a great instrumental composer, was not so far wrong as it has recently been thought to be. It is in this realm that he is supreme, and that the contrast with his great compeer is almost entirely in his favour. While a great deal of Handel's instrumental music is now faded and *passé* in

style, the smallest minuet by Bach contains matter for study, and exhibits qualities of construction and expression which can never lose their value to musicians or to intelligent hearers; the exception being only, as already noted, in some of those chorale preludes which are connected with a form of religious expression in music which is now obsolete. As a vocal composer, his works remain a monument of astonishing power, of rock-like stability, of sometimes poignant expression of religious yearning, but pervaded by a certain monotony of style and character, which is perhaps truly expressive of the one pervading subject, the religious life, which is at the centre of them all. He is the subjective composer; Handel the objective artist. He is the musician of the student; Handel the poet of the people. Neither can be spared, nor perhaps is it to much purpose after all, to dispute which of the two be most valuable in the world of art—a matter in regard to which even individual feeling will vary with individual mood or circumstance. What is important is that each should be correctly appreciated, and placed on his own honoured pedestal in the musical Pantheon.

ART. IX.—*Le Droit International de l'Europe*. Par A. G. HEFFTER. Traduit par JULES BERGSON. Quatrième Edition Française. Augmentée et annotée par F. H. GEFFCKEN. 8vo. Berlin and Paris: 1883.

THE present century in the history of International Law is marked by an increasing tendency to mitigate the severities of war and by a greater harmony of opinion on the principles which govern intercourse between States. It would be difficult in these days for one nation to order its relations towards other countries on arbitrary laws of its own. As in each community the individual is compelled to obey the rules which society considers it prudent to establish, so in the vaster commonwealth of nations every State is bound to recognise the rights of others and to concede an agreement to the body of general laws which tradition, public opinion, international engagements, and the force of circumstances have gradually constructed. The necessity of a universal observance of certain settled principles is now of essential importance when the rapid intercommunication between countries and the variety and complexity of their political and commercial relations are annually increasing.

The closer contact into which States are now drawn, and the magnitude of the interests which are involved, have necessarily demanded greater and more solid guarantees for the undisturbed prosecution of international intercourse. On the other hand, when war breaks out the general welfare requires that its area should be limited and its evils rendered temporary. The object of a war should be clearly defined, and the efforts of the contending parties directed solely towards that object. The rights of nations during peace, and the duties of belligerents, both towards each other and in regard to neutral States, are full of complications and difficulties, and the gradual establishment of a system of laws, treaties, and precedents to guide Statesmen through this confused maze has proved of inestimable benefit. There is yet much to be done, but a great and notable advance has been made since the last century.

We have selected the fourth edition of Herr Heffter's work for review on the present occasion because it appears to us to be one of the most compendious and practical treatises on the subject, as well as the most recent. But in justice to other writers it must be said that the law of nations and the important questions arising out of it have been treated with great industry and ability by several contemporary jurists in our own country and in America whose works cannot be passed over in silence. Professor Lorimer, in his 'Institutes of the Law of Nations,' has given us, in a permanent form, the lessons which he has long delivered with marked distinction in the law schools of the University of Edinburgh, and has sought to place the law of nations on principles of philosophy, which might be termed transcendental. Sir Travers Twiss has just published an 'Essay on Belligerent Rights on the High Seas since the Declaration of Paris.' Manning's 'International Law' has been edited by Mr. Sheldon Amos. Sir Edward Creasy has left us a book of first principles entitled 'The First Platform of International Law.' Mr. Hosack's 'Rise and Growth of the Law of Nations' is rather a history of the subject than a treatise. The work of the American writer Halleck has been re-edited in England by Sir Shenton Baker; and the University of Oxford has given us from the Clarendon Press Mr. William Edward Hale's very valuable and complete treatise entitled 'International Law.' The last English edition of 'Wheaton's Elements of International Law,' edited by Mr. A. C. Boyd, is a work of great merit. Fifty years have almost elapsed since the publication of the first edition in 1836, yet Mr. Wheaton

remains the highest modern authority on these questions; and Mr. Boyd's notes and additions comprise the controversies of an eventful half-century, bringing down the treatise to the present time. We confess our inability to discuss so much learning and so many conflicting opinions in the compass of a single article. We have therefore taken M. Heffter's book as our text; but we shall not lose sight in the course of these observations of the other works we have mentioned. They all prove that no branch of the law is studied with more ability and research. None, in fact, touches interests of equal magnitude, for it concerns the peace and welfare of the world. The application of the law of nations is intermittent, for it is chiefly called forth by war or the causes which may lead to war. When a crisis of this kind arises, the science of International Law is discussed with intense eagerness, for the fate of nations may depend upon it. But the best preparation for such events is the study of its principles and lessons when they can be discussed without prejudice and without passion. We shall endeavour to lay before our readers some of the most recent results of these enquiries.

Amongst the benefactors of mankind we consider that impartial and skilled international jurists should take a high place. There are many writers on the law of nations who have employed their knowledge and their pens to advocate some special theory or to attack some single nation, but who have merely distorted and obscured where they should have unravelled and enlightened. Yet the great authorities who have explained the true nature of international relations, who have compiled from their diligent researches, with the sole desire of establishing justice and truth, laws and regulations which should be universally recognised and made invariable, and who have preached humane and Christian doctrines, deserve all honour and respect.

To the list of these jurists the name of Heffter may be confidently added. Although in many respects he does not rise to the level of the greater luminaries, and though on some points his views are narrow and biassed, yet he is always careful, painstaking, and honest, and evidently seeks to be unprejudiced and impartial. His work lacks the grasp and breadth of view of Wheaton and others; his statements are occasionally not strictly accurate, his deductions not always sound; yet he is entitled to a place in the higher class of modern international jurists. He has been fortunate in his French translator, and has received the

compliment of being fully and most ably annotated by Professor Geffcken. Writers have great difficulty in recording and illustrating the frequent changes which are occurring in the domain of private and public international law. The many editions and various and copious commentaries on Wheaton prove what numerous explanations and additions are needed, and the contributions of an annotator soon become as valuable and as important as the labours of the original author. The editor of Heffter's work took a judicious step in placing the revision of the new edition in the hands of M. Geffcken. The clearness of his notes, combined with his critical insight, great knowledge, and judicial mind, have, in our opinion, very considerably enhanced the value of the text. It is true that M. Geffcken has not been so generous as Mr. Lawrence in his edition of Wheaton in his supply of cases for illustration. He was, doubtless, anxious not to enlarge the edition beyond a handy and convenient size.

The questions in International Law which have been most fiercely debated and on which there still exists a wide divergence of opinion are those which relate to the rights and duties of neutrals during maritime war. On these points England has been, and still is, constantly attacked by most continental writers. The absolute immunity of private property at sea, with the exception of contraband of war, is advocated both by Heffter and Geffcken. Heffter asserts that 'nothing within the domain of International Law is sadder than the position of neutrals in presence of maritime powers of the first class. The policy adopted by the Powers since 1854, and especially since the Paris Conference of 1856, have, it is true, led to considerable improvements, but humanity, relying on the principles of justice, ought to expect some further and more noticeable marks of progress.' M. Geffcken considers the Declaration of Paris as a 'half-measure,' and argues that it would be in the interest of England herself that the complete exemption of all private property, enemy or neutral, from capture at sea should be established. He concludes his argument with the ominous warning that 'those in England who still oppose the adoption of this doctrine will be convinced of its truth in the first serious war in which they are engaged.' The question is, no doubt, one of the highest importance to English interests, and it is possible that in some measure the existing regulations might be turned to our disadvantage. When, during the late Russo-Turkish war, hostilities were on the point of

breaking out between England and Russia, the latter country equipped what is popularly known as the Volunteer Fleet, consisting of fast-steaming cruisers, intended to prey on our commerce. We are quite ready to admit that it would be impossible for any maritime Power adequately to protect the whole of her mercantile marine, especially in our case, where our merchant ships are scattered over the whole face of the globe. It was, therefore, frequently asserted in the continental press that the time was arrived when England would feel the consequences of her refusal to grant immunity to private property at sea. This fleet of fast sailers would elude the vigilance of the English cruisers, and would be able to inflict grievous injury on British commerce. The high rates of insurance and freight which would, in consequence, prevail would dissuade neutrals from embarking their merchandise in English bottoms, and the carrying trade would depart from English hands. These and many similar sinister prophecies were then made, and it is interesting to examine whether they are well founded. It is not the first time that they have been uttered, nor are there wanting voices in our own country which have been raised against our maintenance of the present rule regarding the liability to capture of private property at sea. Mr. Cobden was a most strenuous advocate for the complete exemption of private property from capture; and Mr. Bright, Mr. Horsfall, and others have ranged themselves on the same side. The question is closely interwoven with that of commercial blockades, and the three propositions formulated by Mr. Cobden represent the views of his party on these points. Mr. Cobden, in a letter to Mr. Ashworth, President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, stated—

‘Without dwelling on minor details, the three great reforms in international maritime law embraced in the preceding arguments are:—

1. The exemption of private property from capture at sea during war by armed vessels of every kind.
2. Blockades to be restricted to naval arsenals and to towns besieged at the same time on land, with the exception of articles contraband of war.
3. The merchant ships of neutrals on the high seas to be inviolable to the visitation of alien government vessels in time of war as in time of peace.’

There are two points of view from which the first of these propositions should be examined: first, whether the present rule presses unduly on neutrals; and, secondly, whether it works to the advantage or disadvantage of a great maritime

power like England. In regard to the first point there can be little doubt that, apart from the inconvenience arising from the right of visit and search, which properly exercised causes no injury whatever, the neutral cannot have any ground of complaint. Indeed, as Sir William Harcourt has pointed out, 'neutrals distinctly benefit by the existing doctrine. The carrying trade of the belligerents naturally falls into their laps in the event of a war, so that the present rule acts both as a fine on belligerents and a premium to neutrals.' With respect to the second point, history and experience, we consider, prove that we ought never to relinquish the powerful weapon that our maritime supremacy has placed in our hands. It is possible that our widespread and enormous commerce may suffer to a limited extent, and isolated acts of depredation may inflict certain circumscribed injuries; but the past does not teach us that any permanent or vital damage can be caused to our commercial interests at large. After every war, and indeed during most wars, our commerce, far from suffering to any appreciable degree, has prospered and advanced; the risks which our merchants run seem to stimulate their energy and enterprise, while heavy blows have been inflicted on the trade of our enemy. The most gigantic engine which has been invented to crush England was the so-called 'continental system' of Napoleon. Heffter, who views with distrust the preponderance of any State on the high seas, in writing on this measure remarks:—

'Maintenir avec une sévérité rigoureuse au dehors, avec une sage modération au dedans, ce système qui tendait à réunir tous les états du continent dans une puissante ligue, fut sans doute le moyen le plus efficace pour combattre avec succès les exigences britanniques. Il n'existait peut-être aucun autre moyen aussi efficace pour réduire à leur juste valeur les prétentions de la Grande-Bretagne à l'empire des mers.'

M. Geffcken, with more moderation, and with more just observation, gives his opinion

'that this praise of the continental system, which aspired to dominate the sea by land, appears to be little founded. It caused more injury to the continent by the annihilation of all maritime trade than to England, whose commerce continued its progressive advance, and surpassed, at the re-establishment of peace, all hitherto known limits.'

A further argument is occasionally advanced against the liability of private property to capture, on the ground that war should be strictly confined to the armed forces of the belligerents, and that private individuals should not be

allowed to suffer. Sir W. Harcourt powerfully destroys this contention. He says:—

‘This doctrine of a political war and a commercial peace seems to me impossible in practice. If such a thing were possible, the whole texture of a national spirit must be destroyed, and the framework of that society which is called a State must be dissolved. The law of self-preservation which presides over the whole organisation of life is founded on the principle that, where one member suffers, all the other members suffer with it. Upon any other principle the corporeal frame would perish, and without it the body politic must be destroyed.’

Dana, the well-known editor of *Wheaton*, treats admirably of this subject:

‘War is the exercise of force by bodies politic for the purpose of coercion. Modern civilisation has recognised certain modes of coercion as justifiable. Their exercise upon material interests is preferable to acts of force upon the person. Where private property is taken, it is because it is of such a character or so situated as to make its capture a justifiable means of coercing the power with which we are at war.’

Private property on land is subject to requisitions, contributions, confiscations, and a variety of misuses. We cannot see why a peculiar protection should be thrown over similar property when on the high seas. Were the three propositions of Mr. Cobden to be adopted, the power of England to use with effect those measures of coercion which pertain essentially to a belligerent would be restricted within too narrow limits. Were commerce freed from feeling any of the effects of hostilities, one great restraining hindrance to thoughtless and reckless warfare would be removed. The more interests are involved in the maintenance of peace, the less is the risk that it will be disturbed.

That the respective subjects of two belligerent powers should not be allowed to trade with each other during the continuance of hostilities is a principle which is almost universally recognised. Heffter admits that a belligerent government has the right to prohibit its subjects from engaging in commerce with those of its opponent; but seems to consider that such commerce may continue on the outbreak of war unless specially prohibited. Mr. Geffcken, with more justice, adopts the opinion of American jurists, that a war of necessity breaks off commercial as well as diplomatic relations, and cites the case of the banker Güterbock of Berlin, who in 1871 was punished for treason on the ground of having subscribed to the Morgan loan. In the Crimean

War considerable relaxations were allowed in the matter of trading with the enemy, and by Orders in Council British subjects were allowed to trade freely to Baltic ports, not blockaded, in neutral vessels, and in articles not contraband, but not in British vessels. No restriction was placed on the importation of Russian produce into England from the neutral ports of the Baltic or in neutral vessels, on the ground that such restrictions would have been at least as injurious to ourselves as to the enemy. So that, in fact, commercial intercourse between the two countries was actively carried on. The American lawyers have been very decided on this point, and have constantly held that commercial intercourse between American citizens and the enemy should be forbidden. Mr. Dana points out that Heffter's suggestion is 'rather an opinion on what is desirable than a statement of law.'

Among the several important questions which flow from the right to capture enemy's property at sea is that of prizes, and the laws which govern the adjudication and condemnation of them. Heffter, while correctly stating the law on the subject, is strongly averse to the exclusive jurisdiction of the prize courts of the belligerents, and speaks slightly of the sentences delivered by Sir W. Scott and others. He would submit the decision on the claims of neutrals in regard to their captured vessels or property to a court of arbitration named by a third party. M. Geffcken is also discontented with the present constitution of prize courts, though he fully sees the difficulty in the way of submitting prize cases to the adjudication of a neutral tribunal. It is well known that a mere capture is not sufficient to transfer the property. Kent observes that 'a judicial enquiry must pass upon the case, 'and the present enlightened practice of the commercial nations has subjected all such captures to the scrutiny of 'judicial tribunals as the only sure way to furnish one proof 'that the seizure was lawful.' At the present day it is extremely improbable that prize courts would deliver sentences not in accordance with the laws of equity and justice, and on a general review of past judgments, the decisions of American and British courts cannot be considered as meriting the criticisms of Heffter. But the law of nations on this subject is not entirely uniform. Captures which are held good in one country are not always sanctioned in another. Thus the case of the 'Springbok' has been the source of endless discussion both in England, Holland, and America. It would be highly desirable that the general principles of

prize law should be more accurately defined by international consent.

Thus, for example, the English law in regard to recaptures appears to be the most reasonable and the most just towards shipowners. By our Prize Acts, a British ship when recaptured is restored to the owner on payment of salvage, no matter what time has elapsed since the original capture nor whether a sentence of condemnation has been passed. The sole exception to this generous rule is when the captured vessel has been 'set forth as a vessel of war,' and in that case the recaptor, if a government ship, retains possession. The American law is not so liberal towards the original owners; and considers that, after condemnation by a prize court, the vessel cannot in any circumstances revert to its first proprietors. As far as can be seen, neutral governments are not called upon to concern themselves with claims on prizes or recaptures, unless any of their subjects are injured thereby, and the case demands diplomatic interference. The 'Emily St. Pierre,' an English vessel, attempting to evade the blockade of the Southern ports, and having goods contraband of war on board, was captured by an United States ship-of-war, and a prize crew put on board. Her own crew, however, succeeded in overpowering their captors, and carried the ship in safety to Liverpool. The American Government demanded its restitution; but Earl Russell replied that the British Government had no jurisdiction or legal power whatever to take or acquire possession, or to interfere with owners in relation to their property in her. The question of recaptures, with the various conflicting laws on the subject, is extremely involved; and Heffter has, perhaps, exercised a wise discretion in passing lightly over the subject. As an instance of the complexity of the question, we will quote a case from Wheaton. A neutral vessel was captured by a belligerent; the prize crew being unable to navigate her, the captain resumed the command. During the voyage the vessel was again captured by another privateer, and carried into Malta, where the claim of the neutral owners was rejected, and the ship condemned as having been rescued from the original captors. The sentence was reversed on appeal, and the vessel restored to the neutral owners, each party paying his own costs. Had other captures and recaptures intervened, which is possible, the matter would have been more complicated.

A delicate point in connexion with captures is the question of the destruction of the enemy's property. Mr. Wildman

states that the first duty of a captor is to bring his prize in for adjudication, and, if this is impossible, his next duty is to destroy the enemy's property, adding the proviso that, if there is a doubt as to the property being hostile, the safe and proper course would be to release it. M. Geffcken cites an apt case in point. In the Franco-German War, the German ships 'Ludwig' and 'Vorwärts' were captured, and immediately burnt by the French man-of-war 'Desaix.' The Bordeaux prize court declared that this act was justified by 'force majeure,' and rejected the claims of the English neutrals who were interested in the cargo. This decision is important, as it affirmed that the Third Article of the Paris Declaration did not guarantee neutrals from damages caused by the legitimate capture of an enemy's vessel, or by the military acts which accompanied or followed the capture. This seems to be going a little too far, as the captors should in justice have been held bound to compensate the neutrals for any damages which may have been caused. In any case, nothing but the most absolute necessity should justify the destruction of a prize.

Some doubts also exist as to the treatment which should be accorded to the crews of captured vessels. M. Geffcken relates that, during the Franco-German War, Prince Bismarck objected to German merchant sailors being treated, when captured, as prisoners of war. M. Geffcken admits that this contention can scarcely be maintained, and considers that the crew of a prize should be held to be prisoners of war as soon as the ship has been condemned by a proper tribunal. This appears to be reasonable, since to liberate the crews might possibly enable the other belligerent to augment its naval power. Prince Bismarck, however, took a different view, and seized, as a measure of retorsion, forty notables of Dijon, Gray, and Vesoul.

In regard to blockades, there is now a fair unanimity of opinion as to what properly constitutes a blockade; and the question of paper blockades may be considered as definitively settled. Some uncertainty, however, still exists as to the date from which a blockade is held to exist, in regard to the duration of time during which the offence of a breach of blockade should continue, and also as to the latitude which should be given to the definition of an intention to force a blockade. Before entering upon these questions, we would notice one rule laid down by M. Geffcken to which we can hardly subscribe. He states that public ships of a neutral should always be permitted freely to enter and depart from a blockaded

port. This liberty of passage may be accorded as a privilege, but it cannot be claimed as a right. As Mr. Dana observes, since neutral vessels of war cannot be searched, the blockading power has the more right to require them to keep clear of the line of the blockade. During the Mexican blockade by France, special orders were issued prohibiting the entrance of neutral ships of war; but it was allowed by special orders in the American Civil War, proving that the question lies within the province of the belligerents to decide.

On the subject of the date from which a blockade should be considered to exist both Heffter and M. Geffcken lay down sound and judicious rules. A due notification, either local or through the government of the blockading power, is held to be a sufficient notice to neutrals. We wish, nevertheless, that these authorities had gone more fully into this question, which is of much importance. The issue of a notice to a foreign government no doubt includes all the inhabitants of that nation, and it is the duty of the foreign government to communicate the information to their subjects. If the subjects are really in ignorance of the notice, it is from their own government that they must claim redress. In the case of the 'Adelaide,' the English courts went still further, and considered that a notification given to one State must be presumed after a reasonable time to have reached the subjects of neighbouring States.

M. Geffcken will have nothing to say, and with all respect we agree with him, to the doctrine enunciated by Sir William Scott and adopted by Sir Robert Phillimore, that there are two species of blockades—a *de facto* blockade only, and a blockade by notification accompanied by fact.* Sir W. Scott held that a notified blockade exists until its repeal has been similarly notified, but M. Geffcken puts the case more truly when he says, 'Tout blocus cesse dès que le fait 'de la force suffisante cesse.'

With regard to the duration during which the offence of a breach of blockade continues, and as to what constitutes an intention to force a blockade, we fear we are unable to be in accord with M. Geffcken. In the first place, he considers that the offence lasts merely as long as the offending vessel is pursued by the blockading squadron. This view is in opposition to the opinion held by English and American jurists. The rule adopted by the latter is that the delictum

* See Phillimore's 'International Law,' vol. iii. p. 476 (second edition).

continues till the end of the return voyage, but ceases on the discontinuance of the blockade. Kent says: 'The penalty never travels on with the vessel further than to the end of the return voyage, and if she is taken in any part of that voyage she is taken in delicto. This is deemed reasonable, because no other opportunity is afforded to the belligerent force to vindicate the law.' Wheaton holds the same view, which M. Geffcken contends '*n'est pas sérieux, parce qu'il suppose que le blocus n'est pas réel.*' No blockade can be so 'real' as to render it absolutely impossible for a vessel to break through; and to limit the risk incurred by the offender to a short chase would be reducing the danger to a minimum.

Both Heffter and M. Geffcken appear desirous to confine within the narrowest limits the definition of a supposed intention to force a blockade. Heffter lays down that a 'simple intention sans un commencement de l'exécution non équivoque' does not suffice, and denies that a neutral vessel *en route* for a blockaded port can be seized. M. Geffcken also considers that a necessary condition to capture is that the neutral vessel should be seized within the blockading limits in an actual endeavour to force the line. The English prize courts have maintained, and we consider justly so, 'That sailing for a blockaded port, knowing it to be blockaded, was in itself an attempt and an act sufficient to charge the party with a breach of blockade, without reference to the distance between the port of departure and the port invested.' Further, that the breaking of the voyage at a neutral port would not throw a cloak of innocence over the act, and if the guilty intention existed when the ship left her own port, it will still remain throughout the intermediate voyages. The 'Stephen Hart' is a very good instance in point. She was captured as lawful prize of war by the United States vessel of war 'Supply,' off the northern coast of Florida, when about twenty-five miles from Key West. Her cargo, which was contraband, had been loaded in England, her destination being Cardenas. The case for the defence was that, if a neutral vessel with a cargo belonging to neutrals be in fact on a voyage from one neutral port to another, as was the case here, she cannot be seized and condemned as lawful prize although laden with contraband of war. On the other side, it was urged that the cargo was destined when the ship left London to be delivered to the enemy, either directly, by being carried into an enemy's port, or indirectly, by being transhipped at Cardenas to another vessel; and that the papers

were simulated and fraudulent in respect to destination and cargo. The court condemned the ship on the ground that the test in such cases consists in the destination and intended use of the property, not in the incidental, ancillary, and temporary voyage; and also that the division of a continuous transportation of contraband goods into several intermediate voyages cannot make any of the parts of the entire transportation a lawful transport.

It is quite clear that the blockading force must not be content to await an unequivocal attempt to force the line before capturing the offending vessel, otherwise the most stringent precautions and the most effective blockade would not succeed in properly maintaining the isolation of the port. The restrictions which Heffter and M. Geffcken seek to impose would tie the hands and cripple the means of coercion of the blockading belligerent, and would be in no wise consistent with a due observance of absolute neutrality. Blockade-runners of the present day are very skilful in veiling the object of their voyages, and are adepts in every possible ruse and deception, so that the belligerents should be allowed considerable latitude in defeating their endeavours.

Neither Heffter nor M. Geffcken is able to throw much new light on the vexed question of contraband, the task of finding an accurate and sufficiently comprehensive definition of the term still forming a great difficulty to international jurists. M. Geffcken cites the following formula proposed by l'Institut de Droit, which merits consideration :—

'Are subject to seizure the articles destined for war which are susceptible of being immediately employed thereto. The belligerent governments must settle, on the outbreak of each war, the articles which are to be considered as coming within the above categories. Are equally subject to seizure the merchant vessels which have taken part or are in a condition immediately to take part in the hostilities.'

M. Geffcken explains that this last paragraph had in view merchant vessels *which were not previously destined to warlike services*, but which might be immediately adapted as instruments of war. In regard to the first portion of the formula the proposal is satisfactory, and an accurate definition of what is considered contraband by the two belligerent Governments would be of great advantage. It also affects neutrals who are liable to capture for the transport of contraband of war to a belligerent.

With respect to the last portion of the paragraph, we do not quite comprehend the bearing of the words M. Geffcken has underlined. It is true the passage is merely quoted from

a proposition by M. Bulmerincq; but it appears to have been accepted at the Zurich meeting. It would doubtless be quite within the competence of a belligerent to seize merchant vessels of a suspicious character, whose destination was a sale to the other belligerent. As Sir Robert Phillimore says, 'the sale of a ship for purposes of war is the sale of the 'most noxious article of war. The sale by a neutral of any 'ship to a belligerent is a very suspicious act in the opinion 'of the English and the American prize courts, and one 'which the French prize courts refuse to recognise.' We consider the proposition goes too far in one direction and not far enough in another. It is too comprehensive in subjecting to seizure merchant vessels so fitted as to be able to take immediate part in hostilities without any qualifying conditions of time, place, and circumstances: and it is too limited in excluding from seizure merchant vessels whose construction does not adapt them to such immediate use. Any merchant vessels may be employed for military purposes in the way of transport. Tug-boats, for instance, though not actually instruments of war, would be most serviceable and useful aids in military operations. Is it intended to exclude such vessels from seizure? Hautefeuille cannot understand how a mere vessel, as yet unarmed, whatever may be its destination, is an article of contraband, being nothing but a 'vehicle.' In our opinion the armament makes but little difference beyond rendering the hostile character more evident. Of all articles of contraband a ship is the most dangerous; and if the fact of its intended transfer to the belligerent can be clearly established, we have no doubt but it should be seized, whatever may be its construction or internal fittings.

Heffter, in his anxiety to guard the rights of neutrals, goes a little too far when he says, 'Il ne peut être loisible 'aux belligérants d'imposer, suivant leurs intérêts spéciaux 'et dès qu'ils en auraient les forces nécessaires, aux nations 'neutres des restrictions plus ou moins onéreuses. Rien ne 'les autorise à donner des lois.' The hands of a belligerent should not be tied to this extent. A variety of circumstances both as to time and place, and the nature and character of the war, affect the determination of the question. The real object in placing contraband on a proscribed list is to prevent any material aid being rendered to a belligerent. The other belligerent is the best judge what, in the circumstances, would constitute such material aid; and it is conceivable that certain articles not generally admitted in the

category might occasionally be susceptible of coming within the definition. In the case of the 'Commercen,' barley and oats were held contraband in a neutral vessel bound to a neutral port, but destined, not for the market, but for the enemy's fleet lying in the port. During the Crimean War, coal was regarded as contraband by Great Britain, regard being had to its quantity and destination, though not by France in 1859 and 1870. In the great war with France in 1793, England considered that all provisions were contraband, and detained all neutral vessels going to France laden with corn, meal, or flour. M. Geffcken mentions that the Law Officers of the Crown held in 1870 that an English vessel taking coals directly to the French fleet was not only guilty of contraband, but violated her neutral character. He implies, however, that the same rule would not apply to a ship carrying provisions to a belligerent port, as they might be destined to non-combatant residents. Such a contention would not be absolutely and universally correct. In regard to the duration of the delictum, M. Geffcken is more liberal towards belligerents in cases of contraband than he is on the subject of blockades. In the former case he admits that 'dolus circuitu non purgatur,' and cites without disapproval the condemnation in 1855 of the Hanoverian vessel, the 'Vrow Howina,' going with a cargo of saltpetre from England to Lisbon, whence the goods were to be forwarded to Hamburg for transmission to Russia. Saltpetre could at that time only be exported from England with a certificate of exclusive neutral destination and a bond to that effect.

We may now turn to the consideration of some other questions arising from a state of war. M. Geffcken makes some very interesting remarks in regard to the rules to be observed respecting the employment of 'guerillas' and 'francs-tireurs' in wars on land. He points out that the majority of the complaints made against the Germans for their conduct towards such bands were completely unfounded; and he cites a curious circular of the Préfet of the Côte-d'Or, which merits reproduction, as showing to what purposes the French authorities occasionally considered such bodies of volunteers might be devoted. The Préfet says: 'La patrie ne vous demande pas de vous réunir en masse et de vous opposer ouvertement à l'ennemi: elle attend de vous que chaque matin trois ou quatre hommes résolus partent de la commune, et se portent à un endroit désigné par la nature elle-même, d'où ils puissent tirer sans danger sur les Prussiens.' Were a belligerent to suffer 'resolute' men, for

their morning's recreation, to post themselves at places where, 'without danger,' they could annoy their enemy, it would be impossible to conduct war on any reasonable or humane principles. The retaliation which, in such cases, a belligerent would be quite justified in taking would increase tenfold the horrors and miseries of war. The practical inutility of *francs-tireurs* was clearly demonstrated in the Franco-German war, where they produced no marked influence on any important military movements of the Germans. On the other hand, in the case of invasion, it would be unjust to treat, as outside the rules of civilised warfare, those bodies of volunteers who, under proper organisation and at the call of the government, rose up for the defence of their country. The only essential condition which M. Geffcken considers should be observed in the levy of such bodies is that they should be provided with a uniform so as to be clearly recognisable as proper belligerents. He justly expresses doubts as to the propriety of the German demands that each volunteer should be provided with a special authority from his government to take part in the war. The Conference held at Brussels formulated some rules on the subject, though, as M. Geffcken points out, Article 10 is inadmissible, granting, as it does, the character of belligerent to the population of unoccupied provinces who rise spontaneously to resist the enemy without being properly organised. No doubt, in future continental wars, volunteers who can exhibit some distinctive badge or uniform, and who are acting under a semblance of organisation, will be treated as belligerents. With the actual enormous armies, popular and spontaneous assistance will rarely be required.

To a certain degree we may term privateers the *francs-tireurs* of the ocean. Privateering, as is well known, has been abolished for the majority of States by the Declaration of Paris, yet there is no doubt that it can be legally replaced by equally efficient substitutes. In 1870 Germany had, at one time, the idea of organising a 'marine franche,' similar to the French '*francs-tireurs*' on land. The French objected to this as a violation of the Declaration of Paris; but, as M. Geffcken demonstrates, the German proclamation would have rendered this fleet homogeneous with the Federal navy for the duration of the war, and, therefore, would have placed it on a footing perfectly distinct from privateers. The proclamation announced that the new fleet would form a portion of the Federal navy during the war; they would hoist the Federal flag, would wear uniform, and would

receive pay, and take the military oath. Her Majesty's Government recognised the perfect legality and propriety of such a course. The volunteer fleet of Russia, organised when hostilities were impending between her and England, would have been of the same character.

With respect to the laws of war, it would almost seem that in some points we have gone backwards rather than forwards. The late Mr. Montague Bernard remarked: 'Now invention racks itself to produce the biggest gun, the deadliest projectile, the most frightful engine of wholesale slaughter. It is possible to go too fast, and too far in this direction.' Heffter says: '*Les lois de l'humanité prescrivent encore l'usage des moyens de destruction qui d'un seul coup et par une voie mécanique abattent des masses entières de troupes.*' Even the Emperor Tiberius could exclaim: '*Non fraude neque occultis sed palam et armatum populum Romanum hostes suos ulcisci.*' Mr. Dana is of opinion that only poisoned weapons and the use of chemical compounds which may maim or torture the enemy need be prohibited. As war will avail itself of science, it is, he considers, natural that torpedoes and other similar inventions should be utilised. The opinion of jurists, however, on this question is of little real importance, as there is no doubt each nation will continue to increase its means of offence and defence in every possible direction. It is not impossible that the invention of dynamite and other fulminating compounds may have as powerful an effect on the art and usages of war as the invention of gunpowder had in the fifteenth century, and perhaps the best result would be to render war impossible between civilised nations by the total destruction of their armies, citadels, and fleets. One may conceive, from what already exists, the discovery of chemical agents of so exterminating a nature, that neither human life nor any structure of man could resist them.

M. Geffcken says it is time to prohibit the employment of uncivilised races in wars between civilised States, and refers to Prince Bismarck's circular relative to the cruelties practised by the Turcos. We, on the other hand, are on this subject entirely of Mr. Dana's opinion; who says: 'The employment, though open and acknowledged, of savage allies who do not recognise the laws of war and of nations against a civilised enemy, is discountenanced by the best jurists and statesmen of modern times. It is not a valid objection that individual soldiers are of a barbaric race or pagan religion when they are subjected to the articles of

‘war, and under the responsible command of officers of a ‘civilised nation.’ We should, in case of necessity, employ our Indian troops in a war with a continental nation, and no objection to their service would be admitted by England.

M. Geffcken makes some judicious and sensible remarks with respect to the regulations of the Geneva Convention for the care of the sick and wounded, and points out that on some points a revision is desirable. The care of an enemy’s sick and wounded may prove a very serious charge, as was shown in the Franco-German War. The British diplomatic authorities had, on the outbreak of the war, undertaken the care of the interests of French subjects in Germany, and this engagement entailed very heavy labours on our various German missions when the number of prisoners grew to such unparalleled proportions. M. Geffcken cites the prediction of M. Thiers, that the Russo-Turkish War would be a contest between two barbarians. The lamentable scenes which then occurred were mainly due to the want of proper ambulance organisation on both sides, and not to any natural evil disposition. He pays a handsome and well-earned tribute to the zealous activity of the English volunteer ambulance corps in the wars of 1870 and 1877.

In the Franco-German War much bitterness of feeling was caused by questions arising from violation of parole. The natural interpretation of liberation on parole would be, that the officer should consider himself neutral during the remainder of the war, without admitting any of the subterfuges which some writers have endeavoured to introduce. He should not, for instance, be employed in any such acts as enrolling recruits, or superintending the construction of fortresses, but should remain perfectly outside any participation, direct or indirect, in the prosecution of hostilities. Certain writers have imposed the penalty of death on offences of violation of parole; and M. Geffcken considers that, in principle, this extreme punishment is justifiable. We should incline to the more moderate view of stricter confinement; while the most effectual preventive and the most galling punishment should be the moral odium which should be cast on such acts. In the American War of Independence Colonel Haynes was hanged by the American authorities for an alleged breach of parole; and the case formed the subject of discussion in the House of Lords. Lord Shelburne on that occasion stated that ‘a greater degree of ignominy, ‘perhaps a stricter confinement, was the consequence of such

‘an action—the persons guilty of it were shunned by gentlemen, but it had never before entered into the mind of a commander to hang them.’

We fear that rather loose ideas on this point were in vogue during the Franco-German War, and that the duty of serving in the liberation of the ‘patrie’ was considered to override any personal moral obligation. M. Geffcken, however, we think, goes a little too far when he says that the order of the Ministry of War of November 13, 1870, ‘promised a reward of seven hundred and fifty francs to every prisoner, without distinction of rank, who succeeded in escaping from captivity, thus wishing to encourage officers to liberate themselves from the hands of their enemy.’ The order was, doubtless, ambiguous in its terms; yet we should hesitate in charging a government with *mala fides* of so grave a character, and it would be safer to assume that the instruction merely applied to those who were not bound by any parole. The smallness of the reward would confirm the supposition that allusion was made only to private soldiers.

We see that M. Geffcken, in commenting on Heffter's remarks respecting reprisals, assumes that England had no right to protest against the confiscation by Frederick II. of the interest due on the Silesian loan to British subjects, but he considers that Prussia was in the wrong, not on the ground advanced by the English Government, but because England had committed no act which justified any kind of reprisals. He refuses to recognise the doctrine that debts, being confided to the faith and honour of a prince, should, therefore, be held as outside the effects of war; and he lays stress on the fact that in the case of the Silesian loan most of it had passed out of the hands of the prince into those of third parties. This transfer, if it should have occurred, does not affect the question. It does not matter to what purposes the prince or government may devote a loan, as long as they remain responsible for the payment of the interest. The fact of Frederick being in a position to confiscate the interest shows that he had full control over the disposal of it. Vattel says: ‘Everything which belongs to the nation is liable to reprisals as soon as it can be seized, provided it be not a deposit confided to the public faith; this deposit being found in our hands only on account of that confidence which the proprietor has reposed in our good faith, ought to be respected even in case of open war. Such is the usage in France, in England, and elsewhere, in respect to money placed by foreigners in the

‘public funds.’ Were it otherwise, general credit would be shaken, and any power who followed the example of Frederick II. would find that it would turn to its own disadvantage. According to strict right, no doubt a government may confiscate the debts of an enemy, but modern practice does not sanction such proceedings, and the exercise of such a right is generally condemned.

In the American Civil War, the Confederate Congress of the Southern States issued an act confiscating the property, of whatever nature, except public stocks and securities, held by an alien enemy. Lord Russell strongly protested against this measure, and stated ‘that whatever may have been the ‘abstract law of nations on this point in former times, the ‘instances of its application in the manner contemplated in ‘modern and more civilised times are so rare, and have been ‘so generally condemned, that it may almost be said to have ‘become obsolete.’ Heffter passes rather hastily over the question as to the right of confiscating debts due by the subjects of one belligerent power to those of another, and the distinction which he strives to establish between different kinds of debts is not very satisfactory. In the commercial treaty of 1794, between England and the United States, it was declared that debts due from individuals of the one nation to individuals of the other should never ‘in any ‘event of war or national differences be sequestered or ‘confiscated.’ As far as we know, the latest instance of a confiscation of debts occurred in 1807, when the Danish Government caused all debts due from Danes to British subjects to be sequestered and paid into the Danish treasury. The British Government were eventually compelled to satisfy their own merchants by an indemnity granted by Act of Parliament. It is probable that recourse will not again be had to similar acts.

Besides embargoes, seizing property and other measures of reprisals short of an actual declaration of war, resort is also occasionally had to what are termed ‘pacific blockades.’ This mode of exercising pressure on a country without going to the length of openly declaring war is exceedingly useful, and is a humane method of bringing a small and recalcitrant power to reason. M. Gefcken appears to hold a different opinion, as he mentions that ‘l’Angleterre s’est fait un nom ‘peu enviable en exerçant des représailles injustes contre des ‘états faibles, par exemple contre la Grèce dans l’affaire ‘Pacífico.’ A measure which causes a temporary commercial inconvenience, while impressing the offending power

with a sense of the seriousness of the situation, is surely a milder and more generous form of protest than any other act of reprisal. M. Geffcken mentions that the proposal of Mr. Gladstone in 1880 to blockade Smyrna in order to force the Porte to yield on the Montenegrin question was rejected by all the Powers. We doubt whether Her Majesty's Government formulated in such precise terms the special measures they might consider necessary to propose to the Powers in order to compel observance by the Porte of its treaty obligations; in any case, it is probable that the fear of a similar action has, on more than one occasion, produced a very salutary effect on the policy of the Turkish Government. The objection to coercive measures of this description is that they produce inconvenience to neutral commerce, and it is a very open question whether the extreme rigour of blockade rules should be enforced. Were the blockade rules entirely ignored, there would cease to be a blockade, and the action of the attacking government would be stultified. But as regards third parties, a state has no right to exercise belligerent rights when no war exists. In the recent operations of the French in Tonquin, France denied that she was at war with China. We should therefore have held that she could not refuse access by any neutral ship to a Chinese port, and that no true blockade could be established unless war was declared.

M. Geffcken justly makes a distinction between requisitions and contributions which are levied during war in an enemy's country. The former he confines to supplies in kind or their equivalent, and the latter to payments of money. The more humane mode now prevailing of conducting war has rendered the system of requisitions less burdensome than formerly, as it is customary to give receipts for the articles which have been taken; which receipts the Government of the invaded country will eventually have to repay to their individual holders. In the Russo-Turkish War such precautions were little or not at all observed, and the nature of the war partook of a ravaging character. In the Franco-German War, on the other hand, the requisitions were levied in a regular and methodical manner, and, with the exception of occasional acts of violence, were duly paid for. M. Geffcken considers that it would have been more advisable if the German military authorities had followed the example of the English in 1815, and had levied the requisitions through the medium of the local officials. It should be clearly understood that neutrals domiciled in an invaded country are

subject, equally with the natives, to the demands and requirements of the invaders. Many complaints were made by Englishmen resident in France, in 1870, that they had been called upon to submit to the same requisitions as were imposed on Frenchmen; but Her Majesty's Government invariably declined to support their representations, on the ground that they were on precisely the same footing and must bear the same burdens as French inhabitants. This decision is reasonable, as those who make a foreign country their temporary or permanent home must be prepared to submit to the inconveniences, as they enjoy the privileges, which such foreign residence may entail.

England does not appear to have always held this view, as in 1848 she made claims on Naples and Tuscany for damages caused to her subjects. Russia declined to arbitrate on this question, for fear of having the appearance of recognising that such claims were even open to discussion, and rejected the proposal on the ground that they were quite inadmissible. The United States in 1851 refused to indemnify the Spanish subjects who were wounded by the populace of New Orleans, though an exception was made in favour of the Spanish Consul in view of his official character. As far as we are aware, no claims were made by the English Government on behalf of those British subjects who suffered during the Commune revolution in Paris; and it would have been in accordance with several precedents had the Egyptian Government declined to entertain indemnity claims on account of the losses caused to foreign subjects during the Alexandrian riots. The large amount which was awarded by the International Indemnity Commission would give some reason to believe that the indemnities were accorded on a very liberal scale.

Much might be written on both sides of the question of the heavy contributions imposed by the Germans on certain districts and towns. The controversy has been so threshed out that it is needless to enter upon it in this place. A considerable amount of ill-feeling might have been avoided if the notions as to the right of an enemy over property, real and personal, lying in the invaded country had been more clearly defined in the minds of both parties. There is a general consensus of opinion that real property is exempt from capture, but it is equally clear that the conquerors should be allowed the usufruct. For this reason an invader has a perfect right to utilise the railways, rolling-stock, and telegraph lines, the public and private buildings;

to draw supplies from the State forests, &c., but he should not go beyond the limit of what is actually necessary to his immediate purposes, and should take care that no permanent injury is caused to the goods which he has taken possession of for his temporary wants. M. Geffcken mentions a case in point, in which the Germans cut down and sold 15,000 oaks from the Government forests of the Meurthe and the Meuse during the occupation of 1870-72. As this transaction could not be considered as necessitated by military operations or as required by the immediate wants of the army, it was disavowed by the German Government. Public museums and libraries, galleries, and artistic collections are generally held to be exempted, as far as possible, from the effects of warlike operations. Private moveable property should not be confiscated except under very special circumstances. M. Geffcken permits confiscation in the character of reprisals, and yet blames the pillage of the Summer Palace at Peking. The destruction and the pillage of the Summer Palace were two separate acts; the former being effected in the way of reprisals for the capture and murder of a party under a flag of truce. The pillage was undoubtedly an unfortunate occurrence, but under the circumstances it would have been difficult to prevent it. Such stringent regulations are now usually enforced in respect to booty and plunder, that we need not fear the revival of the looser customs of former times.

The early chapters of Heffter on the rights of neutrals are most ably annotated by M. Geffcken. To our mind this is one of the most satisfactory portions of the work, and these observations form a most valuable addition to the literature already published on the subject. It is extremely desirable that the number of neutralised States should be multiplied as much as possible; Belgium, Switzerland, and the Ionian Islands are, as is well known, all in enjoyment of the valuable safeguard of neutrality; so also are the Inter-oceanic Railway of Honduras and the future Panama Canal. Recently steps have been taken towards the neutralisation of submarine cables, and it would be of advantage if further progress were made in this direction. The Suez Canal may perhaps be placed in the same category: hostilities in the Canal would cause such irreparable injury, that arrangements should be made to prevent the possibility of their occurrence.

M. Geffcken is careful in distinguishing between the neutral government and its subjects, and would not make the former responsible for every violation of neutrality com-

mitted by the latter. He says truly, 'No government can be made absolutely responsible for all the acts of its subjects. If every violation of neutrality committed by the subjects of a State is to become the object of negotiation between the respective Powers, we should never see the end of such discussions.' In the active correspondence which took place between Count Bernstorff and Lord Granville in 1870, as regards the sale and exportation of arms by private individuals to the French, the German Government made both inconsistent and unwarranted representations. Their complaints were inconsistent not only with their own action, for during the Crimean war the Prussian Government placed no prohibition on the trade of their subjects in supplying arms to the belligerents, but also because they took no exception to the flagrant cases which occurred at the same time in the United States, where the Government publicly announced that they took the opportunity to sell their surplus stores of arms. The exportation on a large scale of arms from America was openly effected with the avowed intention of selling them to the French Government. In the Russo-Turkish War no steps were taken, as far as we know, by the German Government to prevent the export of Krupp guns to the belligerents. It is almost universally admitted, with the exception, perhaps, of the erratic writer Gessner, that a government is not bound to interdict the exportation of arms. Occasionally conventions have been made, stipulating that such export should be forbidden; but the conclusion of such agreements show that without them the prohibition would not have existed. Count Bernstorff, in his correspondence, in order to strengthen the weak legal side of his case, advanced many arguments in favour of the policy of compelling a cessation of the traffic, and pleaded for the observance of what he termed 'a benevolent neutrality.' M. Geffcken remarks that this proposal of a benevolent neutrality is an impossibility, for that which is benevolent to one side must in a corresponding degree be injurious to the other. Had Her Majesty's Government agreed to the German proposals and suddenly prohibited the exportation of arms, the French Government would have been perfectly justified in regarding such a measure as unfriendly towards them. The trade in arms and contraband of war is carried on at the risk of the trader, and the power of interference with neutral commerce which is allowed to the belligerents should be considered as a sufficient concession to their requirements. It can hardly be

expected that neutral States should cripple to an undue extent the commercial operations of their subjects. It has even been occasionally asserted that a neutral government should prohibit subjects from subscribing to loans raised by a belligerent power. In principle, no doubt, assistance to a belligerent in the form of loans is scarcely in accordance with a strict observance of neutrality; and M. Geffcken cites the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, who in 1863 declared that 'subscriptions for the use and avowedly for the support of one of two belligerents by individual subjects of a government professing and maintaining neutrality, are inconsistent with that neutrality.' This theory, although unimpeachable as a statement of law, is not considered to be of sufficient importance to demand the interference of the executive to enforce it; and it is generally held that the participation of neutral individuals in war loans need not engage the responsibility of their governments. In 1854 France complained that a Russian loan had been publicly opened in Holland, and demanded that Prussia and Hamburg should forbid its quotation in their territories. No action was, however, taken by these two Governments in the matter.

Down to recent times the principles in regard to the duties of neutrals were very loose. A neutral government permitted, without any objection being raised by the belligerents, levies of men and equipment of vessels in their territory. From the latitude formerly allowed in such cases, England has, perhaps, profited more largely than other nations, as the greater portion of her campaigns on the Continent were carried on with the assistance of numerous mercenary troops. On the other hand, our Foreign Enlistment Acts are strict in forbidding any British subject from entering into the military employment of a belligerent government; yet the individual infractions of this rule are frequent, and unless they are exceptionally notorious, they usually pass unnoticed. Most countries are excessively jealous of any foreign country attempting to recruit within their territories, and such endeavours may lead to serious misunderstandings. During the Crimean War, Sir John Crampton, our Minister in Washington, was compelled to leave the United States owing to the representations of that Government in regard to the share he was supposed to have had in recruiting for the British army.

Our space scarcely permits us to enter upon the complicated question of what constitutes the fitting out and arming a vessel by neutrals to the order of one of the belligerent

parties. The matter was so thoroughly debated during the discussion and subsequent settlement of the 'Alabama,' and kindred cases, that little further can be said on the subject. The rules which were laid down in the Treaty of Washington were, as we showed at the time, a gross departure from the established principles of the law of nations, adopted apparently for a particular purpose; and so far are they from having been adopted by other nations, that they have fallen into merited oblivion and have been acceded to by no other State. It might be hoped that at least the United States, which profited by the innovation in their favour, would not disclaim the obligation it imposes on neutrals, but we suspect that is not the case. As was said at the time by an eminent writer, 'Les Anglais ont tout au plus créé un pré-cédent—valable pour eux et pour les Etats-Unis, mais il n'en résulte rien qui puisse lier les autres états.' It is needless to revive a past controversy, but we have read with satisfaction Mr. Boyd's emphatic condemnation of the Rules admitted by the Treaty of Washington, when 'England agreed that her liabilities should be judged of by rules which she admits were not in force at the time when the acts she is charged with were done,' and 'when the tribunal of arbitration was bound to act in a manner contrary to all the known principles of justice.' That extraordinary transaction is probably the only instance in history in which a great nation broke the Law of Nations in a sense directly adverse to its own interest, and entered a Court of Arbitration only to invite a condemnation, which might have been self-imposed.

One of the best and most instructive books on legal questions which has come under our notice is Mr. Wharton's Commentaries on Law, International and Constitutional, published at Philadelphia in the present year. We strongly recommend it to our readers, and we regret that we are unable to notice it at greater length. But what says Mr. Wharton of the celebrated Three Rules? He repudiates them altogether. He says that, now the war is over, 'political opinion in the United States has swung back to its old bearings.' During the civil war they strained the rights of belligerents to the last excess. England defended the rights of neutrals. Under the Three Rules, England was punished by an iniquitous award for what the subjects of a neutral power had a right to do. But now the tables are turned. Mr. Wharton declares that the Rules would impose an intolerable burden on the United States; that no

free government can repress sympathy with either belligerent; that the 'Three Rules' are to be deemed limited in their operation to the single matter of the Alabama claims; and that 'these rules, repudiated as they have been by the contracting powers, and rejected by all other powers, are to be regarded not only as not forming part of the law of nations, but as not binding either Great Britain or the United States.'* Such is the condign sentence of an eminent American jurist on the compact of Washington, which cost this country three millions sterling for an offence it had not committed. It is not even binding on those who profited by it! Such are the consequences of ignorance or an insolent disregard of the principles of international law. We have never ceased to protest against that arrangement, and we are not sorry to record the censures which cast indelible discredit on the authors of the Treaty of Washington.

The regulations affecting this question, which were promulgated in H.M.'s Proclamation of Neutrality of August 9, 1870, were most stringent. The precautions adopted by the German Government to prevent the vessels built by the Chinese Government in Germany from proceeding on their voyage, when hostilities between China and France were imminent, prove that governments are now conscious of the necessity of exercising 'due diligence' in hindering such transactions. M. Geffcken points out that the prohibition of the equipment by neutrals of ships destined to warlike purposes is of no very recent date, as the American Neutrality Act of 1818 forbids the armament of such vessels by American citizens, and requires that before leaving port such vessels should deposit a sum of twice their value, as a guarantee that they should not be employed against States with which the United States were at peace. In 1848 this rule was applied when Denmark, then at war with Germany, purchased a vessel in America.

Heffter devotes very little space to the important question of the slave trade; and the few remarks he makes throw no new light on the subject. He considers that the endeavours to abolish slavery will not be successful until '*l'équilibre général sera établi sur les mers; le jour surtout où tous les états du concert européen auront proscrit l'esclavage.*' We do not quite comprehend in what manner the general equilibrium on the sea will assist towards the cessation of slavery; and we trust that Heffter has not thereby intended

* See Wharton's 'Commentaries,' paragraphs 241-244.

any suggestion that the maritime supremacy of one power at all delays the abolition of the trade. England, far beyond any other power, has done much towards the suppression of the slave trade; and she is the only State which continues her serious and persistent endeavours to completely efface the traffic from the globe. The action of other powers is chiefly limited to concluding treaties with that end; but none of them take such active and consistent measures as England to carry these treaties into effect. A certain amount of confusion appears to exist as to the engagements into which England has entered with Oriental States in regard to the abolition of slavery; and the outcry which was raised on the subject of General Gordon's Soudan proclamation as to its alleged recognition of slavery proves that very loose ideas are prevalent with respect to this question. We should carefully distinguish in our minds between slavery and slave trade. In the convention between England and Turkey agreement was arrived at to prohibit all traffic in slaves; but not a word was mentioned which could imply that the abolition of domestic slavery was intended. This portion of the subject was left untouched, as it would have been impossible to have obtained the consent of the Sublime Porte to a complete and sweeping revolution in all domestic customs, arrangements, and traditions of its subjects. The abolition of domestic slavery means the eviction and dislocation of the large majority of households in the East, and would entail an incalculable amount of misery and discontent. It would be quite impossible to put such a measure into execution. It should further be remembered that a domestic slave in the East is generally in as good, if not a better, position than a servant in the West. A slave is regarded not as a dependent of the household, but rather as a member of the family; the servitude is not perpetual, but lapses after a certain number of years or in certain conditions; and the lot of very many of these individuals is a happy and contented one. The convention, therefore, wisely avoided any endeavour to disturb this deeply rooted institution, and limited its objection to suppressing the traffic in black slaves. The caution which was observed in regard to the susceptibilities and customs of the Oriental precluded any allusion being made to the commerce in white slaves; which, however, owing to the recruiting ground having in great part fallen into the hands of a Christian Power, is gradually dying out. The horrors attending the hunts after African slaves, their deportation to the coast, and their subsequent

treatment in the slave dhows, were fully recognised by the Sublime Porte, who readily agreed to the adoption of stringent measures for the suppression of the illicit traffic. Should the provisions of this convention be duly observed by both sides, much will have been effected towards the total abolition of the slave trade. We imagine that General Gordon, in his Proclamation, in nowise intended to countenance the traffic in slaves, but did no more than explicitly declare what the above-mentioned convention tacitly admitted, that no man would be disturbed in the possession of his slaves.

Heffter has an interesting chapter, rendered still more worthy of perusal owing to the commentaries of M. Geffcken in regard to private persons in their international relations. This section refers to the laws of extradition and of emigration, to the rights of asylum, and to the general conditions governing the position of individuals in foreign countries. Heffter considers that emigration is an imprescriptible right of every individual, and that every man should be freely permitted to choose his residence in any foreign country. This right is naturally limited by certain safeguards which every State was justified in imposing. No State is bound to accept, without distinction, every individual who desires to settle within its territories, nor can every subject of certain States put into execution this imprescriptible right of emigration. It might be occasionally convenient for a State to ordain the banishment of certain classes of its subjects, yet it would be allowable to other States to refuse them hospitality. M. Geffcken remarks that '*l'expulsion implique nécessairement la translation dans un autre état; et aucun état n'est tenu d'accueillir des étrangers, témoin la protestation de l'Angleterre contre les envois de communards en 1871.*' And again: '*Chaque état a donc le droit de défendre l'entrée de son territoire à un étranger dont les intentions lui sont suspectes. A plus forte raison a-t-il le droit de poser les conditions sous lesquelles il lui accorde le séjour et d'y mettre fin: toutefois il n'exercera pas ce droit sans motif suffisant.*' These principles are of importance at a time when the French Government appear to contemplate the wholesale exportation of their criminal population to islands within a measurable distance of the coast of Australia. They may, no doubt, people their own islands with convicts; but the Australians will assert an equal right to close their territory against French citizens. The Swiss Government were perhaps the last who adhered strictly to the right of any individual to claim asylum; but having for some time

compelled the Cantons to receive every political refugee, they in 1851 followed the example of other States, and left the question to be decided as it seemed best to each Canton. On the other hand, some States, such as Germany, do not permit unrestricted emigration, and decline to allow their subjects to leave should the period of their military service be at hand. There are different laws in various countries in regard to the continuance of the tie with the mother country after emigration. Some States, such as Austria, Russia, and Denmark, consider in some measure emigration as expatriation, and as severing the tie which unites to the fatherland. An instance of this principle, as respects Russia, is to be found in the Russian Jews who have settled in Palestine. These individuals, being ill-treated by the local Ottoman authorities, were taken under the protection of the British Consular officials, their own Government considering that they had no longer any claim to Russian assistance. The result has been that these persons and their families are treated while in the Ottoman Empire as quasi-British subjects, as the only other alternative open to them was to adopt the Ottoman nationality. The peculiar position of these Jews lies in the fact that, should they leave the Ottoman dominions, they would find themselves without any national character whatever, as the British protection is only operative within Turkish territory; and the Russian Government appear to have definitively discarded them.

The numerous extradition treaties show that the views of Grotius and Vattel as to the obligation imposed on a State to surrender offenders are not generally shared, and the general opinion seems to be that special conventions are necessary to procure their delivery. Without such conventions no State can be considered to be bound to surrender those who have taken refuge within its territory. England has lately shown, in the case of Tourville, and in the treaty she has concluded with Switzerland, her willingness to deliver up her subjects who have committed heinous crimes in foreign countries. And Heffter considers that '*un gouvernement se trouvera quelquefois dans la nécessité morale de livrer un sujet à un autre état où celui-là a commis un crime d'une atrocité extraordinaire.*' Geffcken is also of the same opinion: '*Il est vrai qu'un gouvernement s'y refuse quand il s'agit de crimes communs incontestables, car il est dans l'intérêt public de toutes les nations qu'aucun crime ne reste impuni et que le droit d'asile ne soit pas un abus.*' It would be well were this principle observed in

those countries on whose frontiers brigandage is active, as in the absence of any special convention it is easy for the malefactors to elude capture by passing over the boundary line. The convention between Turkey and Greece for the suppression of brigandage has lapsed, and as there is no extradition treaty between these two countries, brigands, when once over the frontier, can enjoy perfect immunity.

It will, no doubt, soon become necessary to revise the rules which have hitherto prevailed in regard to non-extradition for political offences, as the latter have occasionally been interpreted to comprise crimes of a serious character. A political refugee who is in any way connected with conspiracies involving danger to the life of the head of the State from which he has fled should, if the circumstances demand it, undoubtedly be surrendered. M. Geffcken suggests that 'le sentiment de la justice exige que l'extradition s'effectue quand l'état requis est obligé de reconnaître que d'après ses propres lois le crime commun est incontestable;' and he adds, 'il est contraire au bon sens de refuser l'extradition d'un criminel qui a assassiné un souverain, quand on livre un malfaiteur qui a tué un bourgeois.' He quotes a curious argument on this point by Ch. Brocher, who considers that 'on ne porte pas la couronne sans accepter les chances d'une position exceptionnelle.' Most States now prevent, by their municipal legislation, any active and dangerous propaganda against the established order in other friendly States from being prosecuted within their jurisdiction. The conduct of the United States in permitting their territory to become the basis for the spread of the atrocious dynamite and assassination policy of the O'Donovan Rossa faction cannot be too severely blamed; and the reply that the municipal law is not competent to deal with the matter is no excuse whatsoever when the interests of a foreign and friendly Power have to be considered. American jurists have repeatedly argued that when municipal laws do not enable a Government to fulfil its international obligations, they should be extended to meet the case.

The third book of Heffter's work is devoted to the treatment of questions relating to the forms of international intercourse, the rights of legation, and other kindred subjects. Although points of ceremonial and precedence are not of such importance as was formerly the case, still they cannot be ignored; and foreign representatives remain at this day extremely jealous of their rights and privileges. The character of diplomacy has greatly changed since the

commencement of this century, and the science is no longer shrouded in the mystery which was formerly thrown over it. Diplomacy, nevertheless, requires special training and qualifications, and an education of the most varied and comprehensive character. A diplomatist should be able to report and talk intelligently on every subject pertaining to political science or to domestic legislation; he should be competent to treat of matters relating to education, commerce, land tenure, local government, in fact, be conversant with all the complex machinery of the life of a State, and hold an intimate acquaintance with the political history of the world, be versed in foreign languages, and skilled in dealing with men of foreign race and habits. There are few professions which demand a more careful selection of those who are to follow it, or a more constant vigilance in affording inducements and opportunities to those who have entered to perfect themselves in the knowledge of their profession.

The absolute extritoriality accorded to diplomatic, but not to consular, agents and their suites in regard to all matters is now universally recognised. A diplomatic agent is justiciable neither by the civil nor criminal courts of the country to which he is accredited. He cannot even be called as a witness; and all that can be asked of him is to give his evidence in writing, though, should he refuse this, no means can be employed to compel him to do so. The only course open to a government of a country in which a foreign representative has committed a serious offence is to address itself to the government of the offending party. The right of asylum formerly possessed by foreign legations has now been completely abolished as far as regards the natives of the country, and only exists in the limited sense of the legation house itself being considered extritorial for the minister and the persons composing his suite. No minister should afford asylum to a criminal of the country, and although the police should not enter the house to seize the fugitive, yet it may be doubted whether they would not be justified, in the event of the minister declining to deliver up the offender, in taking measures for the capture within the precincts, after proper warning has been given and due regard is paid to the character of the residence.

The minister is supposed to exercise jurisdiction over offences committed by members of the suite on one another within the precincts of the official dwelling. In 1867 a Russian officer committed an act of violence within the

Embassy house on the person of one of the attachés. The Embassy called in the police authorities, who arrested the offender; and on the Russian Ambassador demanding the extradition of the officer, the French Government acceded to the request, merely objecting that the privileges of the Embassy had been renounced by recourse having been had to the assistance of the local police. It is still an open question to what extent the privileges of the ambassador extend over those members of his suite who are natives of the country to which he is accredited. The regulations on this point differ in various countries. M. Geffcken observes: 'On ne voit pas pourquoi un serviteur de l'ambassadeur d'Angleterre à Berlin qui fait des dettes ou commet un délit ne pourrait y être traduit en justice comme toute autre tierce personne;' and he adds that, by a German law of 1877, the extraterritorial privileges do not embrace those servants who are German subjects. This appears reasonable, as there is no ground for exempting from the local jurisdiction those natives who form part of an ambassador's suite in an unofficial capacity. The benefits, however, which are derived from extraterritorial privileges are not so important or of such personal advantage in Western as in Eastern countries. Owing to the capitulations, the position of foreign missions in the Ottoman Empire and their dependants and nationals is of an exceptional character, and, in fact, they form an *imperium in imperio*. The privilege, therefore, of being included within the favoured categories is eagerly sought after, and a Christian Ottoman subject considers himself peculiarly fortunate if he is able to find shelter under the protecting mantle of a foreign legation or consulate. These privileges, in certain cases, might be modified with propriety, as in many places in the interior a small unpaid consular agent is enabled to dispense the favour of his protection to individuals who have scarcely a right to claim it. The Porte is becoming alive to the abuses which have crept into the system, and are endeavouring to limit them as far as possible.

There are many other points in Heffter's work on which we should have wished to touch, but we can with confidence recommend this new edition to students of international law, who will find in the notes and commentaries of M. Geffcken, for the most part impartial and moderate, valuable aids towards a just appreciation of a complex and difficult subject.

We should gladly turn from the discussion of these

abstract theories or past examples of international law to the burning questions which are pressing at this moment for a solution. But it lies not within our province to review the current events of the day upon information necessarily imperfect, and still less to speculate upon the political combinations of the future, in which the unforeseen always plays so large a part. It is not for a literary critic, unversed in the mysterious procedure of Parliament, to judge the arrangements which effectually defeat the progress of public business by employing the maximum of time and discussion to give birth to the minimum of legislative results. But to an outside spectator all parties are equally to blame. Governments have the incurable habit of proposing three or four measures at once, when not more than one can be passed. Legislation by independent members is rendered impossible. Night after night is wasted in debates which lead to no solution. Thus in the present Session it has long been apparent that the London Municipal Bill, the Merchant Shipping Bill, and the Local Government Bill would not be carried. The last of these three Bills has not even been produced. If the time wasted on these abortive measures had been judiciously applied, there is no reason that a Redistribution Bill should not have proceeded concurrently with the Franchise Bill, and thus the whole ground of the opposition to the latter measure would have been swept away. The late Sir Robert Peel used to say that the House of Commons could only attend to one important measure at once, and that a Minister having at his back a competent majority should propose nothing that he is not resolved and able to carry through. It is obvious that the present chaotic state of the House of Commons is much less due to any powers of obstruction in the minority than to the mismanagement of those whose duty it is to conduct the business of the House, chiefly from the attempt to embrace more than they can accomplish.

It so happens that whilst we write these lines three political controversies of the utmost magnitude and importance are urging their onward course to a solution; and, short as the interval is before the usual date of our publication, it is possible that within a few days that solution, which we can neither foresee nor foretell with confidence, may be arrived at before these pages meet the eyes of our readers. The negotiations with France as to the future occupation and government of Egypt are avowedly incomplete, since they depend on the resolutions of the Conference and the

final assent of the House of Commons. The course which may be taken by the Powers in the Conference is unknown to us, although it is evident that from the moment this country renounces an exclusive influence in Egypt, we already find ourselves the subjects of a 'multiple control.' And concurrently with these discussions, the Franchise Bill has been sent up to the House of Lords, which has refused to give a second reading to the measure without a preliminary condition or assurance which the Government has not assented to. We deeply regret this decision of the Upper House, which appears to us to be an error both in politics and in tactics. Had the Peers expressed their assent to the principle of the Bill by a second reading, they would have occupied a far stronger position in their attempt to connect it with the Redistribution Bill of the future. This, then, is the crisis of the political year, and it was described by the Prime Minister as the most momentous event he remembered since the Repeal of the Corn Laws. It is one of those critical conjunctures in public affairs which either overthrow a Ministry or establish it with increased confidence and power. We anticipate for Mr. Gladstone's Administration the latter result.

It is true that recent events have strained the ties of party allegiance to the utmost, and that there is much in the policy adopted by the Government, especially in Egypt, which does not commend itself to the approval of a large portion of the Liberal Party. For in the eyes of some the Government did too much in going to Egypt at all; and in the eyes of others it did too little in not assuming a more direct control over the administration of the country. But the Liberal Party are not moved on this account to resort to the extreme measure of turning out a Ministry, which on other grounds has their strong support. Members of the House of Commons naturally seek to postpone as long as possible the evil hour of dissolution; and they were not disposed to sacrifice the principal measure of the Session if by any means it could be carried. Least of all are the House of Commons and the country ready to turn out the present Ministers in order to bring in the Tories. Without leaders who inspire real confidence to the nation, without discipline in the ranks of their supporters, without a single man who combines the fervour of talent and eloquence with maturity of judgement, the Tory Party never was less able than at this moment to succeed to the direction of affairs; and they have materially increased their difficulties by their own rash

language and false tactics. We suspect that the more prudent members of the Opposition are well aware that nothing would be more fatal to constitutional and Conservative principles than a premature obligation to undertake the duties of office in their present condition.

We had hoped that this consideration might influence the reception of the Franchise Bill in the House of Lords. It is now acknowledged by all parties to be just and desirable that the franchise should be extended to the rural population on the same terms on which it is possessed by the population of the boroughs. Therefore on this, which is the main point of the measure, there is nothing to fight about. Was it wise or politic to hazard a violent contest for accessories, when in fact the main issue has been surrendered? That the franchise will ere long be extended in the manner proposed and contemplated by this Bill, is as certain as any future event can be. The Opposition ostentatiously proclaim that they are not hostile to the principle which extends to the counties the rights already conceded to the boroughs by Lord Beaconsfield's Reform Act. The point in dispute was therefore reduced to a very simple and narrow issue. It related merely to the time and manner in which the boon should be granted, and to the close connexion which could be established between the two portions of one great measure. Would it not have been more prudent to reserve the influence of the House of Lords to make the Redistribution Bill a fair and just representation of all parties in the nation without incurring the odium of bootless opposition and unnecessary delay?

In our opinion, the main object of the Bill being accepted by both parties, there is a fair case and a clear necessity for a compromise as to the time and mode in which it shall be brought into operation. It was already conceded that the newly enfranchised voters could not exercise their rights before January 1, 1886: a period of eighteen months therefore still intervenes for the settlement of the question before that date; nor, in point of fact, is the lapse of a few months, more or less, of any serious importance in a matter of such grave moment as a change in the basis of the Constitution. Unhappily, party spirit runs so high at this moment that each party imputes to its antagonists motives and purposes which are neither honest nor honourable. The Ministerialists accuse the Opposition of making use of a pretence to defeat the extension of the Franchise altogether. The Opposition accuse the Government of a design to postpone the

Redistribution Bill until they should be able to dissolve the existing Parliament and call a new one, elected by the extended body of newly enfranchised electors. We believe both these charges and suspicions to be unfounded and unjust. The House of Lords by passing the Franchise Bill would have deprived the Government of any excuse for delaying the Redistribution Bill—and even if the Redistribution were defeated next Session, a dissolution of Parliament must speedily follow. Sooner or later these differences will probably be settled by an appeal to the country, and, in our opinion, the sooner that appeal is made, the better it will be for all parties.

But we can see nothing in the present state of this controversy to justify the irritation and impatience of those who are seeking to agitate the people, and even to attack the Constitution, because a particular measure is not carried quite as soon as they expect and desire. If the British Constitution is not a pure democracy, and if the House of Commons is subjected like all the other institutions of the country to checks and limitations (far less stringent than those which the President and Senate of the United States apply to the House of Representatives), it is absurd to attack one of the co-ordinate branches of the Legislature because it delays the passing of a fragmentary measure, in order that the whole subject may be brought in a more complete form before Parliament. It would seem even now, if we may hazard the speculation, that if the Franchise Bill and the Redistribution were brought in simultaneously at the autumn session of the present year, the former Bill might be passed before Christmas, and the latter in the ordinary Session of 1885. It is extremely to be regretted that the proposition for a compromise which, we understand, was actually made by the Government to the leaders of the Opposition, was rejected by them, without, it would seem, the knowledge of their followers.

The agreement between the English and French Governments with reference to Egypt turns mainly on a single point. England agrees to withdraw her forces in three years and a half; France agrees to send no troops to Egypt without the consent of England. Each country is jealous of the occupation of Egypt by the other, and this has led them to a self-denying convention. As M. Ferry puts it: 'We agree that Egypt should be neither French nor English, but European!' We have never desired to annex Egypt to the British Empire,

or to assume the burdens which the government of Egypt carries with it. But we conceive that the honour and the interests of Great Britain are engaged in the accomplishment of the task she has undertaken, although we have never disguised the fact that the engagement was not one of profit but of sacrifice. Sacrifices indeed have been made already to an extent only to be justified by the conviction that England has vital interests at stake in Egypt, to be protected, if necessary, even at the cost of war. We have sent a naval and military expedition there; the British army has fought three battles, not without loss of valuable lives; and the financial proposals submitted to the Conference impose on this country fresh pecuniary obligations. Of all this we do not complain, provided the result be commensurate to the cost, and we believe that Egypt, under an efficient British administration, would soon recoup even larger advances. But to surrender the country, at the end of a short period, to anarchy or the conflicting control of an International Board, is simply to renounce everything that has been done, and to consign Egypt to ruin.

If the object of the agreement entered into with France were simply to obviate and adjust any differences which might arise in Egypt between ourselves and the French Government, we see no reason to complain of it. But some of the provisions contained in it appear to us to be detrimental to British interests and absolutely fatal to the welfare of Egypt herself. To name the precise moment at which the British occupation is to cease may be convenient to those whose chief anxiety is to escape from the country, but we view with the greatest apprehension any engagements which bind us to a particular action at a given moment in presence of an uncertain future. Who can tell who will be in power on January 1, 1888, either in England or in France? What will then be the state of Europe? What will be the exigencies of the times to come? This much is certain, that if the British occupation is limited in terms to a period of three years and a half, little or nothing can be done in that time for the improvement of the country. The dread of an uncertain future will paralyse all enterprise. Egypt requires capital and credit to revive her trade, to restore her revenue, to improve her railroads, to open her canals, and to extend the cultivation of her exuberant soil. Will anyone embark in such speculations with the knowledge that in 1888 the government is to pass into other hands? and what hands? The first duty of a good administration is to inspire confi-

dence. With that, everything may come right; without it, nothing. And on what grounds can Great Britain be induced to invest capital or credit in Egypt unless she is well assured that she retains and controls the financial resources of the province as her security? Under such an altered state of things, even her actual investment of four millions in the Suez Canal would be insecure, and the additional eight millions it is proposed to lend to Egypt would either make us her chief creditor or rest on no real security at all. In point of fact this large sum would not be advanced for the benefit of Egypt at all; it would be absorbed by the enormous claims for indemnity and by the most rapacious of her creditors.

The British nation has not lost its interest in General Gordon, nor is their admiration diminished for the tenacious heroism with which he has held his ground under circumstances of unparalleled difficulty and danger. But an impenetrable veil hangs over the Soudan and the beleaguered garrisons which still check the advance of the Mahdi, we know not with what success. Ere long that veil must be lifted, and if we are not much mistaken it will disclose a state of affairs that raises military and strategical questions of the first importance. The barbaric and fanatical followers of the Mahdi appear to be slowly gathering round the provinces of the Upper Nile, and with the end of the Ramadan it is probable that more active operations will begin. We are not at all sure that the flame of rebellion, fanned by religious excitement, may not break out in Upper Egypt and even in Cairo. Whatever else may be shared or surrendered in Egypt, it will not be disputed that the defence of the country from foes without and foes within devolves upon the British army as long as our forces remain there. The task may become one of no ordinary difficulty, for all sound military authority is opposed to an advance into the Western Soudan, or any attempt to encounter the forces of the Mahdi at a distance of 300 or 400 miles from our base of operations. Our policy must be to hold Cairo with an ample force, to select and fortify the best positions on the banks of the Nile, and to operate by naval forces on the river. But we retain the belief that the opening a line of railway communication from Suakim to Berber is an object of paramount military and commercial importance. We trust that these questions have been carefully studied, and that the Government is prepared to meet them; for as long as the Mahdi threatens Egypt with an invasion, which the native troops

are wholly unable to resist, the very existence of order, industry, and civilisation is endangered.

Another of the proposals which would take effect on the termination of the British occupation is what is termed the neutralisation of Egypt; and Belgium and Switzerland are cited as examples of a similar arrangement. But Belgium and Switzerland are countries capable of self-government and, to a considerable extent, of self-defence. We believe that the idea of establishing an autonomous Egyptian Government, capable of administering and defending the country, is a total delusion. Egypt has hitherto been governed by Turks, who, whatever their faults may be, have shown far greater ability there than their successors. Their government was rapacious, cruel, and corrupt, but at least it held the country and even extended its dominion. The desire of England has been to repress abuses, to establish justice, to relieve the population from excessive burdens; but the result is a state of bankruptcy, universal discontent, and the presence of barbarian hordes on the frontier, who have defeated two Egyptian armies, and are now only held in check by the British forces. But what is neutralisation? It cannot mean that Egypt is to belong to nobody. Neutrality is a state of things which only arises in the event of war, and then it means that the neutral State should not only take no part in the war, and should not be made the scene of hostilities, but that it should abstain from any act favourable or adverse to either belligerent. The neutralisation of Egypt would mean that her territory should be strictly closed, in the event of war between other Powers, against the passage of the armed forces, whether naval or military, of either belligerent; for she could not give a passage to the forces of one of them without *pro tanto* injuring the other. This rule has been strictly applied by Belgium and Switzerland: when the French troops were driven to seek refuge across the frontier in 1870, they laid down their arms, as the principles of neutrality required.

But the right of passage for our forces through Egypt, at all times both in peace and war, is precisely the chief object which gives us a potent interest in the country. It is believed (perhaps erroneously) that in the event of war in the Eastern regions of the globe, including India, China, and Australia, the passage through Egypt is essential to Great Britain. Suffice it to say that if the principles of neutralisation were strictly applied to Egypt, the passage must be closed; and if the passage is expressly left open by treaty to

armed forces, there is an end of neutrality. The stronger Power must be mistress of the passage. Far from being a guarantee of peace, this pretended neutralisation might become a cause of war. It is, like the other remote projects embodied in this agreement, a mere mirage of the desert, wholly unsupported by the realities of the case.

These are considerations which suggest themselves on a superficial examination of an arrangement which is still very imperfectly known to us. We find it difficult to believe that the British Parliament will consent to sanction an act of repudiation, or will agree to pledge the credit of this country to a large amount without a positive assurance that we shall hold a security based on the resources of Egypt and under our own control. Nor do we believe that the British nation is so indifferent to the welfare of the Egyptian people or to the task of reform which it has undertaken, that it will allow them to relapse into subjection to Turkish despotism, or to military anarchy, or to the authority of any other European Power.

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
OCTOBER, 1884.

No. CCCXXVIII.

ART. I.—*The Works of Alexander Pope*. New Edition; including several hundred unpublished letters and other new materials. Collected in part by the late Right Hon. JOHN WILSON CROKER, with Introduction and Notes by Rev. WHITWELL ELWIN and WILLIAM JOHN COURTHOPE, M.A. Vols. i., ii., iii., iv., vi., vii., viii. London: 1875–1883.

POPE received the present homage of his generation. For a time he basked in the fullest sunshine of popular favour; but during the last century the chill shadow of disrepute has rested on his name. The reaction was inevitable. He is the most un-English of our poets; his merits are exactly opposed to those of the succeeding school. His work was one of discipline; he enforced the need of proportion; he gave laws to the anarchy of genius. For the varying clouds and gleams, which constitute one of the charms of our literature, he substituted the metallic brilliancy of the classic model. There was truth in the charge that English vigour was sacrificed to French *netteté*, thought to style, creative power to delicacy of workmanship. His drudgery of finish and patient labour of composition were intolerable to his successors; yet their easy, graceful use of their own language is an eloquent tribute to the genius they disparaged. To his detractors his poetry seemed townish, courtly, artificial not genuine, ephemeral not universal, the poetry not of nature but of art, the offspring of the fashion to write verse rather than prose, and not of that high-strung sensibility which compels the true poet into song. The adulation of his admirers, who claimed for him a place by the side of Shakespeare or of Milton, was even more dangerous to his reputation than the depreciation of his enemies. The controversy which raged round his name left his right to the

title of poet in dispute and threatened his prescriptive claim to correctness. His moral character inflamed the bitterness of the contest. Every part of his life is beset with difficulties, or obscured by mysteries, which involve his literary position and bias the sober judgement of the critic with the scorn of the moralist. Even French critics, from whom general appreciation might be expected, are divided. But of late years, against M. Taine's unfeeling estimate may be set the sympathy of Sainte-Beuve for 'cette quintessence d'âme, . . . cette goutte de vif esprit dans du coton.'

The heated atmosphere of personality in which Pope lived infected his literary executors. From Warburton to Roscoe his editors were partisans. They might be friendly or hostile, they could not be impartial. Each strove rather to demolish the opinions of his predecessors than to establish a true view of his author. Theories, not facts, were the battle-ground; arguments, not enquiry, the weapons. The text of their author was of secondary importance, relatively to the ventilation of their own crotchets. Thus engaged, they had neither leisure nor inclination for research. They embodied time-honoured traditions, kept alive century-old slanders, accepted venerable inferences from insufficient evidence or unsupported gossip. Pope lay buried beneath the mass of irrelevant or superfluous lumber which was piled upon him by the pompous panegyrics of Warburton, the miscellaneous learning of Warton, the hasty prejudice of Bowles, the credulous adulation of Roscoe.

A new edition in the place of the rambling, discursive commentaries of previous editors was urgently needed. Within the last thirty years modern investigation has revealed more of the personal and literary history of Pope than transpired during the previous century. Not only has new knowledge been obtained, but the wells of information, which were once so freely used, are proved to be poisoned at the very source. Impartiality had become easy. The personal enmities which Pope's genius and satire provoked are long forgotten; the bitterness of the literary contest that his name formerly aroused is assuaged; the interval between the present edition and that of Roscoe terminates the rivalry of successive editors. There were newly-discovered treasures of correspondence to be published, new results of enquiry to be incorporated with old material. It was full time to remove the reproach that Pope was the worst-edited of English poets by offering the dispassionate criticism of editors who were neither assailants nor advocates, but trustees of the

reputation of their author. Equally imperative was the need for the work of destruction. Part at least of the cumbrous scaffolding which concealed the original fabric was useless, and required removal.

Most of these wants are met in the excellent edition of Pope which is now approaching completion. It not only supersedes all its predecessors, but to a study of Pope's life and works is absolutely indispensable. The plan of the new edition was laid and much of the material collected by the late Mr. Croker. His work was carried on by the Rev. Whitwell Elwin, who brought out two volumes of the poetry and three of the correspondence. Subsequently Mr. Courthope became editor, and under his supervision two more volumes of poetry have appeared. All that is valuable in the notes of previous editors is preserved; the superfluities and errors only are omitted. In one respect the notes might with advantage be still more curtailed. Pope undoubtedly borrowed largely from other poets. But many of the parallel passages collected by Wakefield and transferred to the present edition, are mere commonplaces which prove nothing for or against Pope's originality. Warburton's commentary stands on a different footing to that of his successors; it had received Pope's sanction, and is therefore printed in appendices to the 'Essay on Man,' the 'Essay on Criticism,' and the 'Dunciad.' The new prefaces and notes contain an extraordinary amount of information, much of which appears for the first time. It is impossible to praise too highly the patient care and painstaking industry with which facts are sifted, omissions supplied, errors corrected. Equally admirable is the ingenuity, combined with wide reading, that has elucidated many passages in the life of the poet and contemporary allusions in his poetry, which were formerly regarded as hopelessly obscure.

Mr. Elwin's chief contribution to the work was his treatment of the questions raised by Pope's correspondence. In this edition are collected more than four hundred and thirty new letters, including letters from Caryl, Oxford, Orrery, Bolingbroke, Bathurst, Broome, and Fenton. The size and importance of this new collection would alone rank this edition above its predecessors. Pope's own letters are the chief support of his claim to loftiness of motive and moral integrity. He professed them to be the artless records of his life, spontaneous expressions of his real feelings, written only for private friends, published piratically, without his consent and against his wishes. As regards all but the

Cromwell correspondence, Mr. Elwin proves Pope's professions to be false. He himself secretly procured the publication which he denounced as surreptitious, and all his letters were carefully edited and prepared for the press. Mr. Elwin goes further; he shows that many of the letters are fabrications, manufactured from correspondence with Caryl, redirected to distinguished persons of the day, to whom they were never sent, with dates and passages altered. The extent of these frauds was not suspected till Dilke published his researches in the '*Athenæum*.' Profiting by his suggestions, Mr. Elwin followed the same line of enquiry. By their minute labour and unwearied patience the labyrinthine maze of deception has been threaded. Pope stands convicted on the clearest evidence, not only of complicity in the piratical publications, but of the graver offence of falsifying his correspondence.

Mr. Elwin's judgement of Pope is biassed by unravelling these intrigues. His impartiality is not proof against his repulsion to a man whom he repeatedly proves to be treacherous. 'The sketch,' he writes,* 'which Lord Macaulay has given of his character, when describing his conduct on the appearance of Tickell's version of the first book of the "*Iliad*," is not too severe for the treacheries and falsehoods which were the instruments of his malevolence, cowardice, and vanity.' But the 'stiletto and mask' view of Pope, which Macaulay so brilliantly urged, is only partially true. It is generalised from one, and that the most unfavourable, side of his character. The portrait was drawn for a special purpose with the art of a consummate advocate. It is one-sided, highly-coloured. Few would agree with Mr. Elwin in his unmodified acceptance of the picture. The same prejudice permeates the whole of his work. Pope receives scant justice from an editor who omits no opportunity of disparaging his author. Mr. Courthope adds to the painstaking industry of Mr. Elwin a finer literary taste. He is also more impartial. His estimate of Pope is broader and truer than that of Macaulay which Mr. Elwin accepted:—

'It will not do simply to brand him as a hypocrite, for the essence of hypocrisy consists in unreality; but, behind the falsities of Pope, there is an eagerness and intensity which gives them a human interest, and makes us feel that, in his poetry, we are in contact with the nature of the man himself. . . . Much of the inconsistency in his conduct will be found to correspond with the union of opposite conditions in his

* Vol. i. *Introd.* cxlii.

nature: the piercing intelligence and artistic power, lodged in the sickly and deformed frame; the vivid perception of the ridiculous in others, joined to the most sensitive consciousness of his own defect; the passionate desire for fame, aggravated by a fear of being suspected by his countrymen on account of his religion; the conflicting qualities of benevolence and self-love; the predominance of intellectual instinct; the deficiency of moral principle. It might be predicted of a character so highly strong, so variously endowed, so "tremblingly alive" to opinion, and so capable of transformation, that it would exhibit itself in the most diverse aspects, according to the circumstances by which it was tested.' (Vol. iii. *Intro.* 26.)

Pope's poetical characteristics were determined by his surroundings. He is emphatically the mirror of his times; he reflects with extraordinary fidelity the tone and topics of the town. He had not the 'strong divinity of soul' which could raise him above the requirements of the age. Most of his poetry belongs to that class of literary development which deals with contemporary society or modes of thought. He adapts himself to the habits and tastes of the fashionable world, substitutes common sense for imagination, rhetoric for passion, appeals to the judgement rather than the feelings. Few poets have so nearly become the corridor through which passes the breeze of national life. It is his misfortune that the era he so faithfully represented was eminently unpoetical.

The first half of the eighteenth century was on the whole a tranquil, prosperous period. Industrial progress and the exhaustion of previous struggles left no room for enthusiasm; it was condemned as far-fetched, unpractical. Common sense, the quality which Pope calls wit, was enthroned in its stead. In politics, religion, society, poetry, the tendency is equally conspicuous. Politics ceased to be coloured by the chivalrous passionate tone of Cavalier and Puritan. Neither Divine right nor social compact was recognised as the basis of government. Loyalty was stifled by a political convention, Republican fire quenched by cold utilitarianism. The Tories avowed indifference to a ruler who was not the Lord's anointed; the Whigs acknowledged their retention of office to be the aim of administration. The moral support of public opinion was neither asked by the ministers nor accorded by the people. Personalities, not principles, stimulated the factions which took the place of parties. As politics became less abstract, they grew more violent. Their concrete form made them popular. They divided society; women patched according to their politics; the opera and the theatre took sides; art and literature were pressed into the service, and suffered in the cause. From religion enthu-

siasm was equally banished by a theology which suspected faith, questioned revelation, demanded evidences to prove the reasonableness of Christianity. It was a curious, not a thoughtful age. It is significant that many men of poetic temperament shrank from the cold glare of Protestantism into the mellow moonlight of the older faith. In society the same tendency was strongly marked. The tension of the struggle which the previous century had witnessed was withdrawn, and society sprang back with the recoil to a light-hearted gaiety, unlike our national earnestness. The nation took its ease from grave pursuits. Life retained little of the adventurous. Men had wealth to gratify and leisure to cultivate new tastes: they acquired literary reputations as amateurs or critics. The club and coffee-house, the newspaper, the bookseller and publisher, proclaimed the rise of an idle class and a reading public, and heralded the time when plebeian genius no longer needed a patrician Mæcenas. Moral and metaphysical enquiry was the chief stimulus to thought, as faction was to energy. A new premium was set on the acts of society when women became a power, and when the difference between the tie-wig and full-bottom, or the upset of a tea-cup was fraught with the fate of an empire. The romance of life was concentrated on the pursuit of gallantry. Pope was never more truly the mirror of his times than when he threw all the passion of which he was capable into the love epistle of Eloisa. Moral refinement fell hopelessly behind advancing civilisation. As at Versailles, artificial manners and strict etiquette were combined with loose conduct. It was not till decorum was outraged that the moral law was considered; unless misconduct sinned against taste, it was hardly regarded as an offence. But at Versailles vice was draped with all the grace and painted with every allurements which civilisation could supply. At St. James's she was sufficiently brazen to move without a blush for her nakedness, and society imitated the coarseness of the Court. Over the social and political memoirs of the day is shed the charm of that class of French literature; there is the same incongruous juxtaposition of serious and gay, politics and scandal, combined with something of the same neatness and finish of mind that touches lightly the light things of society, and something of the same sprightly wit and sparkling epigram to temper the despotism of the Whig aristocracy. Poetry shared in the same lack of enthusiasm. It was the poetical age of reason. It was still the fashion for men of letters to appear before the public in

verse, but prose was usurping the place of poetry. Artistic elegance and scholarly form replaced the varied fancy, the exuberant imagination of the older English school. Poetry subsided into an argumentative, didactic, useful character. It grew classical and courtly, embellished familiar objects and everyday events. But it ceased to be 'intellectual opium-eating.' It was kept in touch with all the movements of the day, scientific, political, religious, social. And this picture of contemporary life was not conveyed through any literary medium. The generation which placed Roman heroes on the stage in perruques and buckles, or adorned the hand that wrote upon the wall at Belshazzar's feast with ring and ruffle, did not seek the disguise of classical or mediæval costume. Its active interests were represented in a simple straightforward style in the ordinary dress of the day. The sublimity and greatness of poetry disappeared, but it was instinct with national life.

For a poet, in the highest sense of the word, the times were eminently unfavourable when politics were degraded into utilitarianism, indifference, or factious violence, when religion aimed only at practical piety, when society ridiculed earnestness, when the materials of poetry were subordinate and secondary interests. Hardly less unfavourable was the broader literary movement which indirectly tended to rob poetry of spirit, to starve passion, to stunt creative genius. Correctness was the aim of this new school of which Pope was the most distinguished exponent. His claim to the title of a correct poet is often disputed. Against it are urged the ungrammatical construction of some of his sentences, the obscurity of others, the harshness or poverty of his rhymes. But in the wider sense, in which Horace practised correctness, and in which Walsh impressed it upon Pope, his title is indisputably established. No work ever left his hand

'Quod non

Multa dies et multa lituræ coercuit, atque
Perfectum decies non castigavit ad unguem.'

The literature of the sixteenth century is the noblest ode to liberty. But freedom has its dangers as well as slavery. During the succeeding century the human intellect, emancipated from bondage, conquered new worlds of thought and knowledge. The conquests were more easily won than assimilated. Men poured out their new treasures and squandered the riches of their fancy in rambling, redundant, slovenly language. They cared nothing for the forms of expression; they marred the excellence of their work by

negligence; they did not know where to stop. Beauties were disfigured by meanness; absurdity joined hands with inspiration. Learning sank into pedantry, fancy into quaintness, imagination into whimsical subtlety. Pope was the last and greatest of a school which 'd'un mot mis en sa place *'enseigna le pouvoir.'* He felt the value of art, the tenfold worth of a thought when it is perfectly expressed. He saw that strength of writing lay, not in the accumulation of epithets, but in the brief directness which stamps vigour on every syllable. His work was to sharpen our native tongue, to use it not crudely but delicately. He laboured to polish inequalities, to prune redundancies, to vary monotony, to impart strength to sweetness, symmetry to exuberance. To him and his school classical literature was the final court of literary appeal; its rule over the world of letters was of Divine right. This classicism reached England from France, where literature aimed at academic applause. It was not the study of the past for the sake of the past; there was no effort to realise the life of antiquity, no sympathy with ancient lines of thought, but only an imitation of the form in which the thought is conveyed, a reproduction not of the tone but of the style. The classics were his model because here alone he found in combination clearness of thought, compactness of expression, perfection of literary finish. Pope did not aspire to the 'sacred madness of the bard,' nor was he a literary recluse, a mystic, or a mediævalist. He lived in the centre of society, participating in all its interests. His ambition was congenial to his practical age. He sought to make poetry '*belle comme la prose,*' a treasure-house of felicitous phrases giving currency to new ideas, fitted to express new wants or treat new subjects with the utmost precision of which language is capable. It is no slight praise to say that he succeeded. His work was of incalculable value, but the debt of gratitude to preceptors is rarely paid. It might be said with some truth that he transformed the wild untaught muse of poetry into a Court beauty, the victim of the '*modiste*' and the posture-master; checked the easy flow of her fancy by inculcating respect for politeness of phraseology; taught her that the display of natural emotion was provincial; banished her from woodland scenes to '*trip down the stairs at Whitehall with gallants in her train,*' lords of the bedchamber for her ushers, peeresses for her waiting-women. But Pope might retort with still greater truth that discipline was necessary when the nymph had become rhapsodical, eccentric, and a slattern.

Pope's lot was cast in a prosaic age; the tendency of the literary movement by which he was most powerfully influenced was unpoetical. On the other hand, his early life was in many respects more favourable to the development of his poetic genius. He has suffered hardly less from his biographers than his editors. Ayre, in 1745, and Ruffhead, in 1769, published lives of the poet which were more mischievous than valuable. Johnson's life of Pope is the most elaborate of his lives of the poets, but he made no pretension to accurate investigation. He drew largely from Spence's anecdotes, which, though not published till 1820, were placed in his hands in manuscript. They had been prepared for posthumous publication by their author, whom Walpole describes as 'a neat fiddle-faddle bit of sterling that had 'read good books and kept good company.' But at his death they were bought back from Dodsley, the publisher, and consigned for another half-century to the library of the Duke of Newcastle. The collection is wearisome, though full of information. Spence is immeasurably inferior to Boswell. He repeats conversations, but the speakers remain initials. He never condescends to the minute details and personal touches which give colloquial individuality to Johnson and his circle. Without Boswell, Johnson would be best known as a writer of pompous rounded sentences. To Pope the want of a Boswell was an irreparable loss. Bowles and Roscoe prefixed lives of Pope to their editions, but neither are works of much merit. The second edition of Mr. Carruthers' excellent biography of Pope, which was published in 1857, unfortunately appeared before the enquiries of Dilke and Elwin were completed. Mr. Leslie Stephen's masterly sketch, which, together with some brilliant literary criticism, embodies the chief results of recent investigation, is the best summary of the poet's life. But by far the most complete and exhaustive account of Pope's career is contained in the notes and prefaces to the present edition of his works, only a portion of which was published when Mr. Stephen wrote.

Pope's 'literary life falls,' as Mr. Courthope says, 'naturally into three periods.' The order adopted here is a slight departure from that of his editor. The first period, that of 'retired study and imaginative composition' ends in 1715. To the second period (1715-26) belong his translations of the 'Iliad' and the 'Odyssey.' The third period (1726-44) is his era of ethical poetry, literary, moral, and political satire.

Pope was born on May 21, 1688. Both his parents were

then over five-and-forty years of age. Neither of them was robust; his father's figure was crooked, his mother suffered from headaches. The son inherited, in an exaggerated form, the weakness of both. Pope says they were of gentle birth. But the connexion which he claimed for his father with the family of Popes ennobled as the Earls of Doune is not established, nor would Lord Hervey's sneer at the obscurity of his origin have wounded so deeply had it been unfounded. His enemies discovered that Pope's father was a hatter, a farmer, a mechanic, a bankrupt. He is known to have been a London draper, residing in Broad Street, dealing in 'Holland's wholesale.' He retired from business with a moderate fortune. But Catholics found safe investments with difficulty. They were compelled to place their money on bond in England or in foreign securities. In the operations of the penal laws originated the traditions that the father deposited his money in a strong box and lived on the principal, and that the son was an avaricious usurer because he lent money on bond. Mr. Pope, the elder, was a sincere Catholic, carrying, it is said, into his new religion the enthusiasm of a convert. He was twice married. The maiden name of his second wife was Turner. She belonged to a Yorkshire family possessed of some landed property, and, probably, attached to the Catholic religion. Alexander Pope was her only child.

Of Pope's childhood little is known. His rapid rise to fame awakens distrust in the memories of friends. The attempt to trace his early tastes or peculiarities is useless, as vain, to use Goldsmith's pretty simile, as the chase of the morning dews in the noonday heat. It is not unreasonable to suppose him idolised by his elderly parents, petted by his nurse, Mary Beech, the 'nutrix fidelissima' who lived with him till her death in 1725. As a child he is said to have had a round, plump, pretty, bright-complexioned face, and a voice so sweet that he was called 'the little nightingale.' In manhood his voice was feeble. Swift complains in the cheerless picture he draws of their meeting in 1726, that his 'loudest tones are low and weak.' Forty years of thought and sickness worked a startling change in his appearance. Sir Joshua Reynolds describes him as 'about 4 feet 6 inches high, very hump-backed and deformed. He had a large and very fine eye, a long hand-some nose.' The face was lined and worn, the mouth seamed with 'those marks which are always seen round the mouths of crooked persons,' the muscles standing out across

the cheeks like small cords, the skin drawn and contracted over the eyebrows by continual headaches.

Pope can hardly be said to have received an education. It was only between the years of eight and twelve that he underwent any sort of training. Before he was eight he was attracted by the pictures to read Ogilby's Homer. He went on to Sandys' Ovid, and an unknown version of Statius. From the family priest, Banister, he picked up a little Latin and the Greek alphabet, but at Twyford School, he forgot, under the 'plagosus Orbilius,' whom he is said to have lampooned, the little he had previously learned. Between nine and twelve he was under a master named Deane, first in Marylebone, then at Hyde Park Corner. This Deane had been a Fellow of University College, Oxford. He was one of the Catholic converts of Obadiah Walker, and at the Revolution was deprived of his Fellowship. Pope, in after life, subscribed to a pension for his tutor, though he seems to have been an inefficient teacher. At twelve years old he returned to the 'paternal cell' at Binfield, 'able,' as he says himself, 'to construe a little of Tully's Offices.' With the exception of a few months under a priest in Windsor Forest, on the border of which Binfield was situated, this was all the schooling Pope ever had.

Perhaps Pope misused his opportunities. Had he wandered, a lonely, thoughtful boy, with his poetic gifts and bright fancy, among the glades of Windsor Forest, he might have grown in richness of imagination and in vigour of creative power. He had leisure for the stillness of thought, the gentleness of musing, which might have revealed to him the 'religious meanings in the forms of nature' that were unfolded to Wordsworth. He took another course; he buried himself in his books. For the next few years he read everything that fell in his way, from Roman antiquities to controversial tracts. 'Nobody,' said his half-sister, Mrs. Rackett, 'ever studied so hard as my brother did in his youth; he did 'nothing else but write and read.' Seneca, Cicero, and Montaigne, he read with keen enjoyment, but philosophy was uncongenial to his vagrant habit of mind. He laid the foundations of the 'Essay on Criticism' by a study of Quintilian, Rapin, and Bossu. He acquired a smattering of Latin, Greek, and French, but he always preferred the works of foreign authors in English versions. Reading only for the sake of the stories and the sense, he never attempted to obtain a grammatical knowledge of languages. Following the call of fancy, 'like a boy gathering flowers in the fields

'and woods,' he went through almost all 'the French and Latin poets of any name, the minor poets, Homer, and some of the greater Greek poets in the original, and Tasso and Ariosto in translations.' Passages which pleased him he turned into English 'not out of vanity but humility. I saw,' he adds, 'how defective my own things were, and I endeavoured to mend my manner by copying good strokes from others.' In this way among other exercises he translated large portions of Statius and of Ovid. But it was to English poetry that his mind was really given. Pursuing with unwearied zest the beaten tracks, or wandering at will among the obscurer by-paths, he acquired a wide and intimate knowledge of forgotten, as well as famous, poets. He revelled in Chaucer's unrivalled tales or the rich and varied picture galleries of the 'Faery Queen,' but he also stooped to borrow from an obscure rhymers, like Flatman, one of the principal beauties of the 'Dying Christian to his Soul.' Among modern poets his favourites were Waller and Dryden. Pope had a large capacity for hero-worship. Dryden was the hero of his childhood, and the great poet, of whom the boy had a peep at Will's Coffee House, remained 'Glorious John' to him throughout his life.

At seventeen he had ranged over a wide and varied field of literature. He was a self-taught man. In some cases the absence of regular education is an advantage. It promotes that aberration from the commonplaces of life and ideas which constitutes originality. But with Pope the disadvantages preponderated. His knowledge, and the mode in which it was acquired, was a train which nearly threw him down, an encumbrance rather than an aid. Reading only what pleased him, pursuing no system of study, he had never trained his intellect to grapple with difficulties. He had lived on the great thoughts of others and cultivated his imitative faculties at the expense of his imaginative powers. He remained throughout his life deficient in mental strength and independence. During these early years he had written quantities of verse. He 'lisp'd in numbers,' and his father encouraged his tastes by correcting his rhymes. At Twyford he had satirised his master; at Hyde Park Corner he had written, and, with his schoolfellows, acted, a play. He wrote the 'Ode to Solitude' before he was twelve, and Dodsley, the publisher, had seen pieces of an earlier date. At thirteen he was engaged on an epic poem, with Alcander, Prince of Rhodes, for its hero, and the scene partly laid under water at the Court of Neptune. In these exercises

he formed his habits of composition. He wrote quickly, but corrected slowly. He had a singular power of standing aloof from his work which enabled him to revise a piece all through with a single view at a time. Thus he would correct separately the style, the language, the versification of each poem. He touched and re-touched till his fastidious taste was satisfied, and the thought cast into the 'liquid marble' of his line. His ear was remarkably quick. As a boy, he says, he could distinguish the softness of Dryden from the smoothness of Waller. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu could not deny his skill, though she called his verse 'all tune and 'no meaning.'

His excessive application broke down his sickly health. Physicians gave him no relief: he prepared for death. Among the friends of whom he took leave was the Abbé Southcote, who determined, if possible, to save him. He hurried to Dr. Radcliffe, stated the lad's case, received his instructions, and carried them to Pope in the Forest. Following the advice of the celebrated doctor, Pope read less, rode more, and recovered his strength. Twenty years later he heard that an abbey near Avignon was vacant. He made interest through Walpole with Cardinal Fleury, and obtained it for Southcote.

Within easy distance of Binfield, even for the five-pound Pegasus of a Catholic, was the village of Easthamstead, where lived Sir William Trumbull, Pope's earliest patron. Sir William, who was ambassador at Constantinople under James II., and Secretary of State under William III., retired in 1697 from public life to his 'native shades.' He became intimate with the Popes, talking gardening with the father and poetry with the son. For the talents of 'little Pope' he had the warmest admiration. From him apparently came the first suggestion of the translation of Homer. Pope was flattered by his notice. He dedicated to him the first of his 'green 'Essays,' the 'Pastorals;' but the friendship afterwards languished. Among the eminent men whom he mentions in the preface to the first volume of the 'Iliad,' the name of Trumbull does not appear; and the honour of the first advice is assigned to Addison. The retired statesman probably seemed a less brilliant acquaintance than Wycherley or Cromwell.

To his Catholic connexion Pope owed his first introduction to literary life. His religion excluded him from the education of the day, but gave him a start in society without which the son of the retired draper might have found his

rise more difficult. Anthony Englefield, of Whiteknights, a Catholic squire, lived within a few miles of Binfield. His daughter married Lister Blount, of Mapledurham, and was the mother of Teresa and Martha Blount. He was also related to John Caryll, of Ladyholt and West Grinstead. Caryll was the nephew of Mr. Secretary Caryll, created a peer by James II., and outlawed by William III. His forfeited estates were granted to Lord Cutts, from whom John Caryll purchased the life interest. As Steele was Cutts's secretary, it is possible that Pope owed his first introduction to him to Caryll. It was at the house of Mr. Englefield that Pope, about 1704, met Wycherley and Cromwell. The boy could hardly have made two worse acquaintances. Wycherley was past seventy, Cromwell nearly fifty, and Pope seventeen, when their correspondence began. Wycherley had been the most shameless of the dramatists of the Revolution. He was now a disreputable, broken-down rake, flavouring his indecencies with wit, hiding the obscenity of his talk with the glamour of his literary fame. Cromwell was a slovenly, deaf, elderly bean, a pedantic grammarian, a hanger-on of fashionable society, a haunter of taverns and green-rooms. Pope's natural standard of delicacy could never have been high; but the coarseness of his tone must to some extent be attributed to the pruriency of these wrinkled satyrs. His friendship with Cromwell lasted little more than six years. He soon discovered that Cromwell's position among the wits of the town was unimportant. He had also become intimate with Steele, who disliked Cromwell and ridiculed him in the 'Tatler.' Lastly, Cromwell was a friend of Dennis. He accused Pope of satirising him as 'the grave elderly gentleman' in the 'Frenzy of John Dennis.' Pope assured him that he was not the author of Dr. Norris's 'Narrative;' but, though they continued to drink coffee and criticise together, their intimacy ended in 1711. Nor did his friendship with Wycherley last much longer. The terms on which the published correspondence places them seem from the first extraordinary. But it must be remembered that Pope tells the story as he pleases. The probable relations are completely inverted: the independence of Pope is contrasted with the flattery of Wycherley; the boy rebukes the famous dramatist for the extravagance of his praise. The rupture of a friendship so strangely begun arose, as appears from the correspondence, out of the literary alliance which Wycherley formed with Pope. In 1706 Wycherley asked

his young friend to select and revise the best of his poems, with a view to publication. Pope readily accepted the task, and lopped the dramatist's withered bays with the 'furious hook' of a Bentley. Three years later a second batch of manuscripts was submitted by Wycherley to the same castigation. This time the fire of Pope's purgatory burned too fiercely for the author: he asked for the return of his papers, and received them back with the recommendation that the poetry should be turned into prose maxims, after the manner of La Rochefoucauld. Here the published correspondence abruptly terminates. From it was drawn the conclusion that Wycherley, piqued at Pope's outspoken criticism, broke off the acquaintance. But the documents on which the story rests are of doubtful authenticity, especially as Pope had to defend himself from the charge of plagiarism from Wycherley. Through Wycherley, Pope was introduced to Walsh, whom Dryden considered the best critic of the day. Walsh was a man of better position than Cromwell or Wycherley. He was a courtier, a Worcestershire squire, and M.P. for Richmond, in Yorkshire. He invited Pope to stay with him at Abberley, but died before the acquaintance ripened into intimacy. In the concluding lines of the 'Essay on Criticism,' Pope laments the death of one who, if he really urged the young poet to aim at correctness, exercised a potent influence on his career.

With these friends Pope began his literary life. The contents of what he called his 'Juvenile Volume' require no comment. Even the most ambitious piece, the 'Temple of Fame,' in which Steele could not see 'anything amiss, of weight to be called a fault, but only a thousand, thousand beauties,' was coldly received by the public, and there is little reason to reverse the judgement of Pope's contemporaries. Pope's first publications were his 'Pastorals,' which Tonson published in the sixth volume of his 'Miscellanies,' in 1709. 'The custom,' writes Pope, 'of appearing in "Miscellanies" is very useful to poets, who, like other thieves, escape by getting into a crowd, and herd together like banditti, safe only in their multitude.' The mode of publication was as well fitted as the subject matter to a poet's first appearance. In 'charming his oaten pipe unto his peers,' Pope followed the example of his master Virgil and his favourite Spenser. The golden age of a shepherd's paradise offers a tempting field to inexperience. Arcadia provokes no comparison with reality. The merits of the poem in some measure depend on the age of the author. But whether

Pope was sixteen, as he alleges, or twenty, as Mr. Elwin endeavours to prove, when he wrote the poem, the softness of the versification and the finish of the language are remarkable.

Walsh praised the 'Pastorals,' enthusiastically. 'It is no flattery at all to say,' he writes to Wycherley, 'that Virgil had written nothing so good at his age.' Walsh probably meant that, considering the different ages of Pope and Virgil, the 'Pastorals' held their own against the 'Eclogues.' With this criticism it is difficult to agree. Pope imitates Virgil, who copies Theocritus. As the copy of a copy, the 'Pastorals' are necessarily further removed from nature, less lifelike than their model. Virgil's rural sketches lack that vividness of impression which his Sicilian master, himself the eyewitness of what he describes, so powerfully produces. Pope is more trite than Virgil; his vague epithets and bare generalities are even less effective. The observations are such as he who runs may read, the patent commonplaces of external description, without local colouring or distinctness. His pictures are as wanting in freshness as those of 'any pastoral poet of Leadenhall Street.' He has gathered nothing, in spite of his advantages, of that rich harvest which is gleaned by the quiet eye of a true lover of nature. Nor is there any individuality in the poem. The reproduction of the pattern is remarkable for technical skill; but barely a thought is the poet's own.

In Pope's first publication originated the earliest of his literary feuds. First in the same 'Miscellany' in which his 'Pastorals' were printed last, appeared Philips's 'Pastorals.' A comparison of the two raised a question, which now admits of but one answer. Pope upheld the classical, Philips the natural theory of pastoral poetry. In the discourse on pastoral poetry, prefixed to the 'Pastorals,' Pope says: If we 'would copy nature it may be useful to take this idea along with us, that the pastoral is an image of what they call the golden age. So that we are not to describe our shepherds, as shepherds at this day really are, but as they may be conceived to have been, when the best of men followed the employment.' Philips, on the other hand, endeavoured to suit his style to the rusticity of his subject, to present a truthful, if refined and sentimental, picture of shepherd life. The rival theories were discussed in four essays, which appeared in the 'Guardian,' in 1713. They were attributed to Tickell, 'without,' as Mr. Elwin observes, 'any evidence.' Philips's verses were extravagantly praised; passages were

quoted from them to illustrate the true style of pastoral poetry; no mention was made of his rival. Pope's vanity was deeply wounded. He wrote an anonymous article for the '*Guardian*,' ironically censuring his own poetry, and praising that of Philips; but the sarcasm was so subtle, that Steele only inserted it with the magnanimous consent of Pope. Henceforward Pope and Philips were enemies. The quarrel is important because both Philips and Tickell were members of Addison's '*little senate*.' Philips hung up a birch at Button's for use on his '*rival Arcadian*;' Pope persecuted '*Namby Pamby*,' Philips with satirical allusions to his '*pilfered Pastorals*,' his episcopal patron, his leanness, and red stockings.

Much as Pope valued the judgement of '*knowing Walsh*,' he rejected his advice to write a pastoral comedy. He felt that Hodge in the garb of Strephon, with pipe and crook, singing in heroic metre, was an anachronism. Arcadian swains might survive on china, but were dead in poetry. Conventional fictions revolted the practical taste of the day; even the classic dress could not conceal their insipidity. Pope turned at once to more congenial topics than the faded sentimentalism of the '*Pastoral*.' The '*Essay on Criticism*' was published in May 1711. It was probably completed in 1709, but underwent careful revision before its publication.

There is little, except the youth of the poet, to justify the extravagant praise which has been bestowed on the '*Essay*.' The title is misleading. It is in effect an explanation of the mechanism of his art, a statement of the principles which guided the movement he represented. As a boy he had at his fingers' ends Horace's '*Art of Poetry*;' he was familiar with Quintilian, Rapin, Bossu; he had studied Boileau's '*Art poétique*,' and the '*Essays*' of Roscommon, Sheffield, and Granville. His letters to Cromwell show that he applied their critical rules to whatever he read. It was no extraordinary feat to translate this knowledge from the prose, in which, as Spence relates, the '*Essay*' was originally written into prosaic verse. His critical rules display little originality. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu declared that the '*Essay*' '*was all stolen*.' Nor is the malicious remark without truth. The conventional canons of taste and criticism which Pope has collected are all borrowed. There are obvious faults in the execution. From extreme compression, the language is often obscure and ungrammatical; harsh inversions and ellipses are frequent; the versification is continually defective; the rhymes imperfect and poverty-stricken. On

the other hand, the criticism on representative harmony is artistically conveyed; and it is, in spite of Johnson's attack, no less just than graceful. Yet both form and theory are modelled on Boileau, whose line in the '*Lutrin*,' where *La Mollesse* relapses into slumber, '*Soupire, étend ses bras, ferme l'œil, et s'endort,*' is a good example of his skill in assisting sense by versification. Fine passages also occur in these digressions in which Pope rises from the low level of didactic verse, such as the peroration to the first book, where the depth and sincerity of his admiration for the classics warms him into the burst of genuine poetry, beginning

'Still green with bays each ancient altar stands,
Above the reach of sacrilegious hands.' . .

The commonplaces of the poem are relieved by some of those pointed happy illustrations which make Pope the most brilliant of epigrammatists, as well as by instances of that pregnant conciseness of language which expresses a common thought once for all, and readily passes into a proverb.

To Pope's aphorisms the English couplet, 'sacred to satire and unquiet thought,' is peculiarly adapted. Laws of rhythm and a system of prosody were introduced by the earlier masters of the Restoration school. It was from Dryden that Pope, as he told Spence, had 'wholly learned versification.' But 'the coursers of ethereal race' were not broken in by Dryden to the full power of their paces. The scholar brought his master's irregularity under stricter rules. His diversity of harmony is produced, not by triplets or liberties of accent, but by variety of pause and cadence. In a lengthy poem, it may be thought that the practice of closing the sense with the rhymes is carried to excess. His clauses coincide with the lines, his sentences with the couplets, with a sameness which becomes wearisome in its monotony. The sense is so seldom allowed to flow on in grammatical construction beyond the couplet that the sneer at Seneca's prose, as '*arena sine calce,*' in some degree applies to Pope's versification. On the other hand, the disjointed style undoubtedly enhances his epigrammatic point.

Addison, in the '*Spectator*,' praised the '*Essay on Criticism*' as a 'masterpiece of its kind;' and his estimate was accepted unquestioned for the next half-century. The poem raised Pope at once to the first rank among poets. The satiric touches which Addison censured in the '*Essay*' were the first indication of the bent of Pope's genius. They involved Pope in a second literary quarrel. John Dennis, a

sour but shrewd critic, had spoken slightly of the 'Pastorals' among the wits at the coffee-houses. Pope retaliated in the 'Essay' with an impertinent allusion to Dennis's personal appearance. Dennis revenged himself by a scurrilous attack on Pope, as 'a young squab short gentleman . . . the very bow of the God of love.' The savage retort struck home. But though Pope persecuted Dennis for years with his satire, he was generous enough to forget his enmity when the critic had fallen into old age and poverty.

From criticism Pope returned to descriptive poetry. 'Windsor Forest' was his new theme. On the hint of Trumbull he had in his boyhood begun the poem, which is modelled on Denham's 'Cooper's Hill.' Portions were now added at the instigation of Lord Lansdowne, and the whole was published at his request early in 1713. 'Non injussa cano' is the motto of the poem, which pays Lansdowne, 'Granville the polite' of Pope's later poetry, compliments as fulsome as the softest dedication with which Bufo was fed. Lansdowne was a zealous Tory. His party looked to the Peace of Utrecht to save England from a Whig sovereign; but the ministry of Harley and St. John was too disunited to frame or effect a policy. Pope, who welcomed the close of the war as a possible prelude to the return of the Catholic Stuarts, was ready enough to celebrate the Peace at Lansdowne's request. His partisanship proved incautious. He set to work to retrieve his error by furnishing the prologue to Addison's 'Cato' in April 1713. 'The prologue writer,' he complains to Caryll (April 20, 1713), 'was clapped into a staunch Whig, sore against his will, at almost every two lines.' Whatever he might privately protest to brother Catholics, his timely trimming succeeded. Lansdowne was committed to the Tower on the accession of George I.; Pope received subscriptions to his 'Homer' from both Whigs and Tories.

'Windsor Forest' combines the commonplaces of pagan mythology with descriptions of English scenery and allusions to contemporary politics. The result is necessarily incongruous. It contains a few striking passages, some exquisite lines, such as that in which Peace 'scatters blessings from her dove-like wing,' and, in Wordsworth's opinion, almost the only 'new images of external nature' to be found 'in the poetry of the period intervening between "Paradise Lost" and the "Seasons."' The passage on rural pastimes is probably that to which Wordsworth alludes. Pope, with all his fanciful power, had little more sympathy with

beauty of landscape than with the sports of the country squires who sang *Durfey's* songs at their 'topping-tables.' But, if the Greeks were equally unsympathetic because they had no *Claudes*, Pope can claim the same excuse when art had degenerated into portrait-painting. He saw nature through the 'spectacles of books;' he describes her as a careful student with the assistance of a classical library, not like a worshipper. He draws what he does not care for, and the copy, though artistic, remains artificial; the picture is correct, but inanimate. It is with the poetry of nature as with sculpture; many sculptors have chiselled beautiful women, yet the cold marble only thawed into life at the touch of a lover. 'A tree,' he reflects to *Spence*, 'is a nobler object than a prince in his coronation robes;' and we feel that Pope in his own mind is always instituting similar comparisons. He had not the seeing eye and hearing ear of an outdoor man; he is more at home in his grotto than in the forest; indoor nature is his province. But he could use the external and physical influences to heighten the interest of human passion. As the dark background of the towers of *Elsinore*, the lonely platform, the bitter cold, the star moving westward as the bell beats one, strike the supernatural note, so Pope employs the gloomy surroundings of *Paraclete* to heighten the desolation of *Eloisa*. Nature with him is but the background of human interests, a space for human action. To him country life and solitude suggested visions of court pageants, 'the imaginary sights . . . of lords and earls and dukes and gartered knights.' He could not, like *Shelley*—

' Watch, from dawn to gloom,
The lake-reflected sun illumine,
The yellow bees in the ivy bloom,
Nor heed, nor see what things they be;
But from these create he can
Forms more real than living man,
Nurslings of immortality.'

In the same year in which the 'Essay on Criticism' appeared, Pope wrote the 'Rape of the Lock.' This was his period of imaginative poetry, when he wrote 'with rapture' 'in the voluntary vein.' The 'Rape of the Lock,' in its own peculiar class, stands without a rival; nothing in ludicrous verse surpassed it for dainty elegance, sprightly gaiety, delicate and playful ingenuity. Nowhere else has Pope brought the polish of language and versification to such perfection. The charm of mock heroic poetry lies in the

juxtaposition of frivolity and dignity, the greatness given to littleness. Pope surrounds the common incidents of social life with the pomp and circumstance of a Trojan war or the foundation of a Roman empire. He paints a lovely coquette equipping herself for conquest with the same particularity as a Grecian hero arming himself for mortal combat. Belinda's seven-hooped petticoat assumes equal importance with the seven-hooped target of Ajax or Satan's 'ponderous shield' whose 'broad circumference . . . hung on his shoulders like the moon;' her bodkin is described with as much solemnity as the spear that rivals the 'tallest pine . . . hewn to be the mast . . . of some great ammiral;' its lineage is traced with no less care than the descent of Agamemnon's sceptre, which was fashioned by Hephestus and wielded by Zeus. The 'Rape of the Lock' is a Cupid pouting defiance behind the shield of an Achilles. The effect of the incongruity is heightened by the solemn march of heroic verse. The poem is incomparable; the fairy creation of Pope's fancy, in its airy brilliancy, glitters like a thread of gossamer sparkling with dewdrops in an autumn sun.

The origin of the poem is well known. Lord Petre stole a lock of hair from Miss Arabella Fermor; the liberty caused a coolness between two Catholic families which threatened to become permanent. John Caryll—not Lord Caryll the Secretary, but the Sussex squire—suggested to Pope that a poem, written on the subject in the easy tone of gentle raillery, might heal the breach. On this hint, Pope, in 1711, wrote the first sketch of the 'Rape of the Lock.' The poem was at first privately printed, but copies were circulated till, as Pope alleges, it became necessary to print in self-defence. It appeared in Lintot's 'Miscellany' in May 1712. The first sketch consisted of two cantos, without the embellishment of the sylphs and gnomes. A year later Pope added the aerial machinery and a dedication to Miss Fermor. Early in 1714 the complete edition of the poem, now increased to five cantos, was published by Lintot.

The insertion of preternatural agents completed the mock heroic character of the poem. Bossu's peremptory command, 'il faut user de machines partout, puisque Homère et Virgile n'ont rien fait sans cela,' possibly occurred to Pope's mind when he consulted Addison on the introduction of machinery. Addison thought so exquisite a piece of workmanship, 'merum sal' as he styled it, might be spoiled by any alteration; he urged him to leave so 'delicious' a thing alone.

The advice, as Pope afterwards stated, 'first opened his eyes to the character of Addison.' In most cases it was sound. Pope's genius triumphed over a difficulty which would generally have proved insurmountable; but the satisfaction he felt at his success shows his consciousness of the risk he ran, and proves the prudence of Addison's friendly counsel.

He determined to sport with, but yet obey, the lessons which critics found in classical masterpieces. What machinery was available for the purpose? His task was to discover beings light enough for mock heroic verse, but not without the semblance of dignity demanded by the epic. He had to make these supernatural agents play their part in the frivolous day of a fashionable beauty. The dignity of Olympian deities required portents for their heralds; the size of genii unfitted them for rapid movements; fairies, shrinking from the haunts of men, holding their secret revels in the chequered glades of moonlit forests, sporting like Oberon with the morning's love but bound to disappear before the sun was fully up, were out of place in a boudoir, ill at ease among patches and powder, bewildered at the card-table.

'The enchanting race of fairies are no more,
The deities of old have wandered out.'

Pope was thrown back on his own invention. Ariel's name suggests more resemblance than in fact exists between Pope's sylphs and Shakespeare's elves. Nor does the passage which Mr. Elwin quotes from Spenser—

'And all about her neck and shoulders flew
A flock of little loves, and sports, and joys,
With nimble wings of gold and purple hue,'

prove that Pope borrowed even the outward appearance of his ethereal creatures. The 'light militia of the lower sky' which nestle in Belinda's bosom, or play at hide-and-seek in the folds of rich brocade, are not the naked Cupids of Spenser's fancy, but tiny devotees of fashion. They could as little tolerate a couch in cowslip-bell as poor Narcissa her woollen shroud. No doubt Ariel's 'lucid squadrons' share the exquisite airiness and tiny invisibility of the subjects of Oberon and Titania. But if Pope's diminutive atoms could be subjected to the microscope, their 'airy garments' would prove the daintiest costumes. They peep, to speak the language of men, out of caps of Brussels point, or from under richly laced hats, as they vie in the manoeuvre of the 'fluttering fan' or the 'nice conduct of the clouded cane.'

To their purpose they are perfectly appropriate. They are unobtrusively omnipresent, never in the way, and never out of it; they come and go with natural ease, too diminutive to appal, too unpretending to need introduction. Like flecks in a sunbeam, they excite imagination but elude perception. Pope's debt to the Rosicrucians is scarcely greater than any which he owes to heathen mythology or popular folk-lore. The sylphs, gnomes, and salamanders of Paracelsus are human in kind but not in origin. They are all powerful beings, but their hearts are agitated by every human passion. Their life is gloomy; their end annihilation. In Pope's hands they become disembodied spirits of mortals who have lived and loved, dissolved in that element which is most suited to their characters on earth, joining unseen in all the anxieties and pleasures of their former life. It is to be regretted that Mr. Elwin says little or nothing of the Rosicrucians, or of the work of De Gabalis, to which Pope alludes, and of which Curll subsequently published a translation.

Pope was not more indebted to his predecessors for the scheme than for the details of his poem. The 'Secchia Rapita' of Tassoni, the 'Lutrin' of Boileau, the 'MacFlecknoe' of Dryden, may have suggested the most appropriate form of treating the subject which Caryl proposed. But Cervantes might equally be said to be the model of the 'Rape of the Lock.' In all four poems, by the side of the chivalrous Don Quixote, jogs the ridiculous Sancho. The resemblance ends with the common features of mock heroic verse. Part of the 'Secchia Rapita' was translated by Ozell in 1710. Though Mr. Elwin makes no mention of it in his preface or notes, the 'Rape of the Lock' is more akin to Tassoni's poem than to the 'Lutrin.' Boileau's masterpiece was, however, undoubtedly in his mind. Mr. Elwin quotes with approval the remark of De Quincey, that there are 'numerous proofs that [Pope] had read Boileau with so much feeling of his peculiar merit, that he has appropriated and naturalised some of his best passages.' In the 'Rape of the Lock,' at least, Pope was under no obligation to Boileau. The 'Lutrin' turns on a squabble in the Chapter of the Sainte Chapelle at Paris. It was the glory of the Treasurer of the Sainte Chapelle to be exempt from episcopal jurisdiction and to possess episcopal privileges. While he sleeps, Discord appears to him, warns him that his subordinate, the Precentor, had assumed the dress of the bishop and given the benediction, and goads him to action. The

next morning the Precentor arrives in the chapel to find himself extinguished by a gigantic reading-desk placed in front of his stall. In his despair, he exclaims—

‘Inconnu dans l’église, ignoré dans ce lieu,
Je ne pourrai donc plus être vu que de Dieu.’

Round the desk centred a struggle which Boileau uses to satirise the ignorance, sloth, and sensuality of the clergy. The few similarities may be traced to a common source. Both imitate some of the best-known passages of classical epics. But it is the essence of parody that the originals should be recognised. Their classical models are differently treated. Boileau faithfully reproduces the external features of the epic. His machinery might do duty in the ‘Æneid;’ personifications are freely used; dreams and omens play a conspicuous part. Even the epic characters reappear. Sidrac, the Nestor of the Chapter, represents the accumulated wisdom of three generations. The comedy of the poem consists in the use of the heroic style on the most trivial occasions by the meanest of persons. Didier l’Amour and his wife Anne separate for a night in the language of Æneas and Dido. The ‘Lutrin’ is a picture of modern comedy set in the dignified framework of the ‘Æneid.’ While Boileau produces his effect by emphasising incongruities, Pope blends the heroic and comical elements into a harmony of inconsistencies. His epic materials are fused into the fabric of the poem. His characters adopt the epic style, but are as empty as the vanities they pursue; though his machinery is formed on the classic model, it is a new creation adapted to the airy nothingness of fashionable frivolity. The component parts of the ‘Rape of the Lock’ cannot be separated like those of the ‘Lutrin.’ Pope has softened the harshness, but doubled the effect, of the contrast.

To find fault with a poem so perfect of its kind as the ‘Rape of the Lock’ is an ungrateful task. But two points may be noticed. In spite of the marvellous grace with which the subject is treated it is not of the most elevated kind. Fancy may illuminate a pack of cards, but the feat is a *tour de force* to display the skill of the poet. The charms of a parody must necessarily be inferior to those of an original creation. There is a more serious blemish in the treatment. Pope not only elevates the little but degrades the great. This combination of the burlesque with the mock heroic no doubt enables him to produce the consistency which is part of the beauty of the poem. But when ‘the

‘nymph, exulting’ in her victory at Ombre, ‘fills with shouts the sky,’ her bad manners pain the numerous admirers of the fascinating Belinda. Still greater is the shock when the loss of her ringlet transforms her into a coarse-tongued virago.

In 1717, Bernard Lintot printed an edition of Pope’s published works which contained two new pieces, ‘The Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady’ and the ‘Epistle from Eloisa to Abelard.’ These two poems are Pope’s most sentimental compositions. By them is ganged his power to express and excite emotion, to touch the deeper feelings of the heart.

Round the ‘Unfortunate Lady’ gathers a mass of fable. Many of the explanations which have been suggested are collected in Mr. Elwin’s preface. Ayre, whose life of Pope appeared the year of the poet’s death, says she was an orphan—noble, wealthy, beautiful, who, separated by her uncle and guardian from a low-born lover, killed herself in despair. This story, though only a prose paraphrase of the poem, was accepted by Ruffhead, and, from him, by Johnson, who condemns the abuse of poetry to ‘treat suicide with respect.’ Sir John Hawkins gives her name as Winbury, adding that she was well-born, rich, but deformed. To prevent her marrying Pope, her guardian forced her into a convent, where she hanged herself. Warton, who adopts this account, attributes the passion and tenderness of the poem to the depth of Pope’s love. Bowles gives a version with a remarkable pedigree. He had it from a gentleman, who had it from Condorcet, who had it from Voltaire. The lady loved a prince of the French blood-royal; she vainly pursued him over the Continent, till, in despair, she retired to a convent, and there put an end to herself. But no clue has been found to either name or history. The lady of the poem never existed in flesh and blood; she was a creation of Pope’s imagination. Yet something more than artistic instinct led him to give personality to the subject of the elegy, and the mysterious hint of his own attachment. Dilke suggests that the ‘Unfortunate Lady’ was Mrs. Weston, wife of John Weston, of Sutton in Surrey, a Catholic squire. She lived unhappily with her husband, but died, neither by sword nor noose, seven years after the publication of the elegy. Pope championed her cause against her husband so zealously that gossip became busy with their names. Resenting her ill-treatment, but dreading slander, he relieved his mind by composing a poem upon her case, while the distortion of the facts prevented the identification of his heroine.

The dramatic abruptness of the opening is borrowed from Ben Jonson, who begins his 'Elegy on the Marchioness of 'Winchester' with

'What gentle ghost, besprent with April dew,
Hails me so solemnly to yonder yew?
And beckoning woos me.'

But the poem has beauties which belong to Pope alone. It is undeniably a striking composition, expressed in terse and vigorous language, full of animation and tenderness. Perhaps the most powerful passage is the apostrophe of the 'false guardian of a charge so good.' On the other hand, it has been thought that the finished perfection of the poem stamps it as the mere production of the brain, too rhetorical to be passionate, a studied appeal less touching than the simple eloquence of mental anguish.

Such criticism applies with less force to the love epistle of 'Eloisa to Abelard,' the finest composition of its kind in the English language. Here is found reality of passion, not only its reflection; here at least it is difficult to stop at the exclamation 'O well-painted passion!' Pope chose his subject well. In the Middle Ages impulse regulated conduct. Passion stimulated men to greatness whether in vice or virtue. Dante might have found a thousand Eloisas ready to his hand. Civilisation casts men and women in a mould. Even when Pope wrote, originality was rare, though often affected. There did indeed exist shades of character which might be seized for the purpose of fine comedy or delicate satire. But in the artificial world of 1717 Pope could find no Eloisa. He had not the dramatic power or knowledge of mankind to create for himself. No one is quicker than Pope to catch the lights and shades which play over the surface of the heart. In his own sphere of fashionable society his judgement was of the keenest, his insight into character peculiarly acute. But his observation was directed to manners and foibles. He understood mankind as a man of science: his microscopic examinations tended to abstractions. In the epistle the outline was drawn for him. He fills in the details with marvellous skill, and paints the omnipotence of love with a force and boldness which prove him to possess the susceptible temperament, the sympathetic genius of the poet.

In the impassioned monologue of Eloisa there are none of the harshnesses of rhyme and rhythm and grammar which disfigure Pope's didactic poetry. The solemn charm of the

musical verse, the grace of the language, are maintained throughout. The outline and many of the details and thoughts are borrowed from the letters of Abelard and Eloisa. These mediæval compositions, whose authenticity Mr. Elwin justly doubts, were translated into French at the close of the seventeenth century. Numerous passages were added, omitted, altered by subsequent editors before Hughes's English translation appeared in 1714. Mr. Elwin proves by numerous extracts that it is this garbled modernised version, and not the mediæval original, which Pope followed. But the poem is far more than an elegant paraphrase. It presents a picture of Eloisa no less dramatic in conception than powerful in execution. The single figure in its pathetic loneliness is thrown prominently forward by the sombre background of gloomy scenery, religious austerities, conventual solitude. On her the light is thrown in concentrated intensity; in her tremendous conflict between earthly and heavenly love all else is absorbed. No shadow of a shade softens the clearness with which Eloisa is presented swaying to and fro with the fierce gusts of passion, now rising, as the tempest lulls, to heights of religious aspiration, now sinking as it gathers fury, to depths of sensual craving. The story is full of those effective contrasts, which no poet ever used more skilfully than Pope; all are made the most of, none are missed. But his skill is carried too far. In his desire to oppose the spiritual longings to the grosser appetites of Eloisa, he has degraded her love for Abelard to mere desire. This vein of coarseness is the only blemish in a poem which otherwise is perfect. Eloisa bids the world farewell; but the lips that kiss the sacred veil are cold; the eyes that should gaze on the Cross are fixed on the earthly lover. The trembling of the shrines, the wonder of the saints, the pallor of the lamps, proclaim the reluctance of the sacrifice, the unreality of the renunciation. The conflict is imminent. Once immured within the walls of Paraclete her present is a blank, alternately a retrospect and a preparation. Now the passionate, erring woman seems to freeze into the marble purity of the saint and forget herself to stone; now, as the warm blood of youth riots in her veins, her numbed but rebel nature revolts against 'the long mechanic paces to and fro . . . the set, 'grey life and apathetic end.' In her worship, her prayers, her penitence, the image of Abelard ever steals between her and God. She envies the lot of the 'blameless vestal,' the eternal sunshine of the spotless mind; yet would not if she could exchange for them the rapturous recollection of her

unholy joys. Exquisite both in feeling and execution are the lines in which she learns that for a grief so unquenchable, a love so unchangeable, the only end is death. Wearied and spent with her struggle, she hears something beyond the moaning of the hollow wind, above the echoes that whisper along the cloister walls, the voice of a departed nun:—

‘Come, sister, come! (it said, or seemed to say),
 Thy place is here, sad sister, come away;
 Once, like thyself, I trembled, wept, and prayed,
 Love’s victim then, though now a sainted maid.
 But all is calm in this eternal sleep;
 Here grief forgets to groan, and love to weep,
 Ev’n superstition loses every fear;
 For God, not man, absolves our frailties here.’

The second period of Pope’s life was spent upon Homer. The proposals for the translation were issued in October, 1713. The first volume of the ‘*Iliad*’ appeared in 1715; it was finished in May, 1720. The last volumes of the ‘*Odyssey*’ were printed in 1726. With the exception of his edition of Shakespeare, this was his only literary work during the period. Wycherley’s protégé had in ten years become, as Swift assured the young nobleman at court, ‘the best poet in England.’ He was already famous; his Homeric translations made him comparatively wealthy. From first to last he received for them little short of 10,000*l.* Perhaps the fall in French stocks which ‘went nigh to ruin’ him, compelled him to undertake the arduous task. At first the work weighed upon him heavily. ‘In the beginning of my ‘translating the “*Iliad*,”’ as he told Spence, ‘I wished ‘anybody would hang me, a hundred times.’ Want of money may also have combined with Pope’s large acquaintance and keen interest in social events to induce the family to leave Windsor Forest. In 1716 Binfield was sold, and the Papes moved to Mawson’s New Buildings, ‘to the water-side ‘at Chiswick, under the wing of Lord Burlington’ (Pope to Caryll, Ap. 20, 1716). There his father, two years later, died and was buried, and Pope and his mother moved to the villa at Twickenham.

His life may be gathered from his correspondence. At the call of Homer he bade ‘farewell to London,’ exchanging ‘luxurious lobster nights for studious days.’ He exaggerates his dissipations like a man to whom boon companionship is not familiar. Health so frail could not endure excess, when ‘two bites and a sup’ beyond his ‘stint’ cost him more than

others paid for a debauch. Even in the days when he possessed—

‘The sprightly wit, the lively eye,
The engaging smile, the gaiety,
That laughed down many a summer sun,’

he never habitually haunted tavern company. It was exceptional for him to sit up till ‘two o’clock over Burgundy and ‘Champagne,’ or to become ‘so much a modern rake as to ‘be ashamed of business.’ Such freaks were rare, although he was ‘the gayest valetudinaire . . . most thinking rake ‘alive;’ had they been the rule of his life, they would not be mentioned in his letters. An old man before he was forty, he could not rise and dress himself without aid. He was laced upright in a stiff canvas boddice, his legs encased in three pairs of stockings; he shivered with cold even with a fur doublet next to his skin. If it is considered how ‘crazy’ was his form, how he suffered from asthma and dropsy, was threatened with cataract, tortured with rheumatism, racked with constant headaches which he vainly strove to alleviate by coffee; how he was sleepless for nights together, only dozing by day after dinner, or over the fire ‘like the picture of January in a Salisbury primer,’ or when the Prince of Wales conversed with him on poetry, it is marvellous that he was so seldom querulous. His brain was always busy; but, without economy of painless intervals, he could never have accomplished what he did. The scraps of paper and backs of letters on which he wrote his poetry show that ‘paper-sparing Pope’ rarely wasted a moment. What time he spared from his work he spent with his friends, or in being rowed on the river by his waterman, or painting, or rambling through the lanes on foot or on horseback with his dog Bounce, decorating his grotto—the subterranean passage that Swift called his ‘*Ars Poetica*,’ laying out his five acres of land which he ‘twisted and twirled, and ‘rhymed and harmonised, into two or three sweet little ‘lawns;’ or in the ‘tender office’—and the hours so spent were the best and purest of his life—

‘To rock the cradle of reposing age,
With lenient acts extend a mother’s breath,
Make languor smile, and smoothe the bed of death,
Explore the thought, explain the asking eye,
And keep awhile one parent from the sky.’

Constitution and habit made him restless. He rides to Bath, stopping at houses on the way; journeys to Oxford to

stay at Magdalen, or visit Clarke at All Souls, or Spence, who was professor of poetry; or spends weeks at the 'lone house' at Stanton Harcourt. He is to be heard of as a guest of Bathurst at Cirencester, of Oxford at Downhall or Wimpole, of Bolingbroke at Dawley, of Peterborough at Bevis Mount, at Ladyholt, Grinstead, Whiteknights, Mapledurham—the seats of his Catholic friends. Till his exile in 1723, Atterbury was a frequent host. He pays visits to the Blounts in Bolton Street, to Gay at his lodgings at Whitehall, to Arbuthnot at his apartments in St. James's Palace or Dover Street. Few public events took place at which he was not present, 'as sure to be there in a bustle as a porpoise in a storm.'

Round Pope gathered a brilliant circle whose names are 'familiar in our mouths as household words.' Besides the Scriblerus Club—consisting of Arbuthnot, Gay, Atterbury, Parnell and himself, with Swift as president—were Garth, Steele, Prior, Congreve, Rowe. Oxford, Bolingbroke, Peterborough, Murray, Berkeley, Jervas, Kneller were his associates. At Twickenham he was close to the royal palaces, and the young Court held at Richmond by the Prince and Princess of Wales, afterwards George II. and Queen Caroline. The atmosphere of the latter was freethinking, for the Princess was an *esprit fort*, a patroness of Tindal, Toland, and Collins; it was also in factious opposition to the king and the ministry. Among the courtiers were Mrs. Howard, afterwards Lady Suffolk, whose grounds at Marble Villa Pope assisted to plan, Miss Bellenden, Miss Lepel, Chesterfield, Bathurst, Scarborough, Hervey. Pope was in his element; he and his friends as Tories supported the Heir-Apparent, the atmosphere of freethought was congenial, the maids of honour—to whom he was

'Tuneful Alexis on the Thames' fair side,
The ladies' plaything, and the Muses' pride—'

graciously received his extravagant gallantries.

Among those who welcome Pope on his 'return from Greece,' or the completion of the 'Iliad,' Gay mentions Hervey, 'fair of face,' Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, and 'youth's youngest daughter, sweet Lepel.' Hervey and Lady Mary afterwards became his bitterest enemies. Hervey inherited, with the abilities of his family, those eccentricities which divided the world into 'men, women, and 'Herveys.' He married, in 1720, Miss Lepel, whose beauty and French vivacity made her the most fascinating woman

of the day. At that time, as a member of the young Court, Hervey opposed Walpole. Lady Mary was a hard-headed, keen-witted, masculine woman. When she wrote her 'Unfinished Sketches' (1714) she hated Pope. Before her return from Constantinople in 1718, her personal acquaintance with him was slight. As correspondents they agreed admirably, as neighbours at Twickenham they inevitably quarrelled. Pope addressed her his wildest compliments, and his divinity accepted the homage in the spirit in which it was offered. Lady Mary's account of the coolness which sprang up between them is, that Pope made love to her and she laughed at him; another explanation is that Lady Mary borrowed a pair of Hollands sheets from Mrs. Pope and returned them at the end of a fortnight unwashed. Perhaps the cause lies between the prose and the romance. Lady Mary's position in society was widely different from that of the Popes; she was a zealous Whig, he a bitter Tory; he sneered at Addison, whom she admired; Swift, Pope's greatest friend, hated her, and the dislike was returned; she had a bitter tongue, was unscrupulous in its use, and had many enemies to exaggerate her remarks. As her intimacy with Pope cooled, her friendship with Hervey grew warmer. Political events widened the breach. After 1727, Hervey, following the fortunes of his master and mistress, became the lay confessor of Queen Caroline, the *confidante* of Walpole, the assailant of Pulteney, Bolingbroke, and the wits of the 'Craftsman.' Pope joined in the war and attacked Hervey as Lady Fanny, and Lady Mary in the outrageous lines on Sappho. Their joint retort, the verses to the 'Imitator of Horace,' taunts him with the obscurity of his birth, ridicules his poetry and appearance, and thus concludes:

'Thou, as thou hatest, be hated by, mankind,
And with the emblem of thy crooked mind
Mark'd on thy back, like Cain, by God's own hand,
Wander like him accurs'd through the land.'

Pope revenged himself on Lady Mary by raking together in his satires every slander to her discredit, and on Hervey by the savage lines on Sporus.

A woman who exercised a kindlier influence on Pope's life was Martha Blount. She was the granddaughter of Anthony Englefield, and the godchild of John Caryll. Pope first met her in 1710, at Whiteknights, where she and her sister, lately recalled by their father's death from school in Paris, were staying. Pope was then twenty-two, Martha

Blount twenty. They did not become friends till some years later. Mrs. Blount and her daughters were slenderly provided for, when they left Mapledurham on the marriage of Michael Blount with Miss Tichborne in 1715. Pope's interest in the family dates from the fall in their fortunes. In letters both to Edward Blount and Caryll, he writes of them (March 1715-6) as 'the widow and fatherless.' Unsuccessful speculations in South Sea stock further diminished their income. Pope joined with them in the purchase of the stock, and assisted them in other investments. The bond on which he paid 50*l.* for six years to Teresa was probably only a business arrangement, though on it is founded the story that Teresa was his favourite till she was deposed for Martha. There is nothing to show that Pope's relations with Martha were not perfectly pure and innocent, a sincere friendship ripened by time into deeper feeling. Miss Blount became almost a member of his household, was treated as one of his family by his friends, invited to accompany him on his visits. The unhappiness of her own home was the first cause—if Pope is to be believed—of her residence at Twickenham. She was not handsome nor even clever: 'it is hard,' writes Pope to Swift of Mrs. Patty, 'that time should wrinkle faces and not harden heads.' But she was a sensible right-thinking woman. Scandalous reports respecting this intimacy arose so early as 1723, 'villainous lying tales,' which Pope suspected Teresa Blount of circulating. It is difficult not to believe Pope's emphatic repudiation of guilt. 'God is my witness,' he wrote to Caryll (Dec. 25, 1725), 'I am as much a friend to her soul as her person.' After her mother's death she became, and remained to the last, what Pope most needed, 'a woman friend.'

Homer occupied the second period of Pope's life. It is easy to find fault with the version, to call it Pope's *Iliad*, not Homer's, to point out the blunders of his defective scholarship. Yet for English readers it is perhaps the best translation, although it is that which least resembles the original. Homer is not among the volumes which have appeared of this edition. Whatever remains to be added to the criticism of Professor Conington or Mr. Matthew Arnold may be expected from Mr. Courthope. At present the interest of the *Iliad* lies in the quarrel between Addison and Pope, which its publication in 1715 brought to a crisis. Simultaneously with the issue of Pope's first volume appeared Tickell's rival translation. Pope fancied that the 'little senate' at Button's instigated by Addison were con-

spiring to ruin his reputation. He and Philips were enemies. He suspected Tickell of censuring his 'Pastorals' in the 'Guardian'; he had heard that Addison was annoyed at his Toryism and the concluding lines of 'Windsor Forest'; he believed that Addison had once given him unfriendly advice, and was now fathering his own translation of the 'Iliad' on Tickell. It is said that his ill-feeling was aggravated by Addison's supercilious rejection of 'Dr. Norris's Narrative of the Frenzy of John Dennis,' a pamphlet written in defence of 'Cato' against Pope's old antagonist. Pope denied the authorship of the 'Whim against Dennis.' If he wrote it, it was insulting in Addison to express through Steele—Pope's intimate friend—his disapproval of the pamphlet. If Steele was the author, Addison's conduct is natural. Still more unlikely is it that Pope was told by Lord Warwick of Addison hiring against him the 'venal quill' of Gildon. Without these doubtful provocations, Pope was already sufficiently irritable. The issue of Tickell's translation completed his imaginary grievances. 'In great heat he wrote to Mr. Addison a letter, wherein he told him he was no stranger to his behaviour, which, however, he should not imitate; but what he thought faulty in him he would tell him fairly to his face, and what deserved praise he would not deny him to the world, and as a proof of his disposition towards him' he enclosed him the famous lines on Atticus. Addison died in 1719; the lines on Atticus were first published in 1723. The extract from Spence quoted above, contains Pope's defence to the charge that he only attacked Addison when he was dead. That the lines were in existence in Addison's lifetime, is proved: that they were ever shown him is doubtful. The only other evidence of a course so unlike Pope's usual proceedings is a letter dated July 15, 1715, which purports to be written to Craggs. But such confirmation is of little weight when so large a portion of the correspondence is proved to be fictitious.

Dilke's discovery of the Caryll correspondence revealed extraordinary facts respecting Pope's letters to Addison and others. The collection consists of nearly one hundred and fifty of Pope's letters, printed by Mr. Elwin from transcripts of the originals, made by John Caryll. When Pope recovered the originals in 1729, he was unaware that copies had been taken. In the edition of his correspondence published in 1737, after Caryll's death, many of these letters reappear, addressed to more eminent persons than the Sussex squire, or blended into manufactured letters, which never passed

between Pope and anybody. Thus four out of the five letters ostensibly addressed to Addison were really sent to Caryll.

By the side of his fabrications, Pope's complicity in the surreptitious publications is comparatively innocent. His letters fall into four groups: the correspondence with Cromwell, published in 1726; with Wycherley in 1729; with 'several eminent persons' in 1737; with Swift in 1741. The letters contained in the first group were published without Pope's connivance. They were given by Cromwell to his mistress, Mrs. Thomas; she sold them for ten guineas to Curll, who published them in 1726. The publication of private letters was then a rare, if not unprecedented, occurrence. But Curll's success encouraged Pope to attempt a similar venture on a larger scale. His difficulty was to find a motive for an otherwise gratuitous display. The clandestine publication of letters between private friends provoked curiosity and silenced criticism. A Dennis could scarcely condemn what was only intended for private perusal. The world would buy with avidity the careless asides of a Pope. If the edition was volunteered by the author, the position would be reversed. No one is curious about open secrets; everyone censures vanity. How could Pope combine the advantages of piracy and editorship? He endeavoured to solve the problem by the series of elaborate plots which are exposed in the present edition.

The issue of the 'Cromwell Correspondence' seemed to Pope to threaten similar proceedings on the part of Curll. In his own custody only would his letters be safe from the Grub Street pirate. He therefore appealed to his friends to return him all his letters which they had preserved. Many of them did so with reluctance. Caryll, as we have seen, retained copies when he surrendered the originals. Three-fourths of the letters Pope recovered he burned; the selected remainder he prepared for the press according to his peculiar views of editing. The originals he retained himself, but copies were bound up in a volume and deposited in Lord Oxford's library. Before his work was completed, he was watching an opportunity to publish; the appearance of Theobald's edition of the 'Posthumous Works of Wycherley' in 1728 afforded him his first pretext. Under the cloak of devotion to his dead friend, he could gratify his vanity and dislike to Theobald. He offered the letters in his possession to prove that Wycherley designed the suppression of these posthumous works; but, as the letters tend to prove the

contrary, he probably thought the excuse too transparent. He therefore sought to produce the impression that the collection on which his challenge to Theobald was founded was published piratically. With this object he placed the correspondence in Oxford's keeping, and announced that it was lodged in his Lordship's library; he had previously handed an edited copy to the printer. His next step was taken without the consent of Oxford, whose honour it impugned. In a letter dated October 16, 1729, he writes to Oxford,* 'I consulted Mr. Lewis upon the turn of the Preface of those papers relating to Mr. Wycherley, and have exceeded, perhaps, my commission in one point, though we both judged it the right way; for I have made the publishers say that your Lordship permitted them a copy of some of the papers from the library, where the originals remain as testimonies of the truth.' In other words, Oxford was to charge himself with a breach of trust. Probably he refused to assume the part of traitor, for the whole edition was so completely suppressed that no copy exists. But the printed sheets reappear in the possession of P. T., the hero of the elaborate intrigue which accompanied the publication of the third group of letters.

The plot opens in November 1733 with an offer to Curll, from a person calling himself P. T., of a number of letters to and from Pope. The offer was coupled with the condition of publishing an advertisement, which Curll refused. Eighteen months later, Curll, wishing to end his differences with Pope, sent him, in proof of good feelings, P. T.'s offer. Pope, in answer, inserted a notice in the newspapers that Curll had threatened to publish a collection of his letters, but that the collection, if it existed, was composed of forgeries. At this moment P. T. renewed his offer to the insulted Curll; the letters, he said, were now printed, but Curll might have them to publish. It is significant that Pope had, in the previous month, withdrawn the bound book of copies, containing the whole of this third group of letters, from Lord Oxford's library. They were never returned. The originals were always in his own custody. This time P. T.'s offer was accepted; the advertisement was published in the required form; several of the originals, then and afterwards in Pope's keeping, were produced for Curll's satisfaction between nine and ten at night by a short squat man, in a clergyman's gown and barrister's bands, who called himself

R. Smythe. From the same hand Curll received a specimen copy of the printed sheets, including sheets of the suppressed edition of the Wycherley correspondence which Pope had bought up. All the subsequent events betray the hand of Pope. The seizure of the imperfect copies by the messenger of the Peers, the collapse of the proceedings against Curll before the House, could have been prearranged by no one but Pope. Though Pope professed to have received the full confession of the mock clergyman, and was publicly accused of stealing his own letters, he never explained P. T.'s possession of the collection, or the originals, or the printed sheets of the suppressed Wycherley correspondence. He repudiated Curll's collection as a mass of forgeries and inaccuracies; but in 1737 he published its facsimile. Even at the time he was generally suspected of complicity in the publication of Curll's edition, but the public were not ill-pleased to see the pirate made to walk the plank.

Pope had hoped to include the fourth group of letters, the Swift correspondence, in his authorised edition of 1737. He was already intriguing for its publication. The victim of his new plot was Swift, whose mental condition rendered Pope's conduct peculiarly base. In 1741 Pope published, as the second volume of his Prose Works, the fourth group of letters. The advertisement states that the edition was printed from an impression sent from Dublin, that this Irish publication was directed by the Dean, begun without Pope's knowledge, continued in spite of his prohibition. A different light is thrown on the transaction by the recent discovery of the Orrery correspondence. Directly after the appearance of Curll's edition of Pope's correspondence in 1735, Pope urged the Dean to return his letters. Swift refused. He should keep them, he said, in his cabinet during his lifetime; after his death they should be burned. Six months later, Swift reluctantly promised that at his death the letters, 'well sealed and packetted,' should be restored to their author; but he resisted all Pope's entreaties to surrender them for publication in 1737. In fact, Pope's eagerness to publish the correspondence was only baffled by the Dean's refusal. At this crisis Curll once more appeared as the *deus ex machina*. Towards the close of 1736 he published two letters to Swift, one from Pope and one from Bolingbroke, alleging that he had received them from Ireland. Wherever he had obtained them, they had previously undergone Pope's editing. It seemed as if Swift's cabinet was insecure. 'Curll,' writes Lord Orrery to Swift, 'like his friend the

‘devil, glides through all keyholes, and thrusts himself into ‘the most private cabinets.’ Pope used, if he did not contrive, the opportunity to press for the return of his letters. His entreaty was now backed by Lord Orrery. Alarmed at the failure of his own precautions, wearied by the persistency of Pope and his friend, with mind and memory failing, Swift at last yielded. In June 1737 he entrusted the letters to Orrery to place in Pope’s hands. Orrery writes (July 23, 1737) to Swift, ‘Your commands are obeyed long ago. Dr. King has his cargo, Mrs. Barber her conversation, and ‘Mr. Pope his letters.’ There was a gap in the correspondence between the years 1716–23. These missing letters are the pivot of Pope’s plot. The Dean’s powers of mind and body were rapidly decaying. ‘I cannot,’ he writes to Pope in July 1737, ‘trust my memory half an hour, and my ‘disorders of giddiness and deafness increase daily.’ Of this forgetfulness he soon gives a signal proof. Twelve months after the letters had passed into Pope’s hands, Swift forgot that they had left his custody. His mind reverted to his original intention. In August 1738, he assures Pope that all his ‘letters received during the past twenty years or ‘more are sealed up in bundles and delivered’ to Mrs. Whiteway, his cousin, with directions at his death to restore them to Pope. In the postscript he hastens to correct his blunder, but with the confusion of an enfeebled intellect. By studiously concealing his receipt of the letters through Orrery, and pointing to Swift’s repeated refusal to surrender the correspondence, by treating the missing letters as if they were the whole collection, by emphasising Swift’s wandering statement in 1738, Pope produced the impression that the Dean retained possession of the letters. Their publication in Dublin therefore seemed natural. But the printed collection contained many letters from Swift to Pope; Swift kept no copies; how, then, could the Irish pirates have obtained letters addressed to Pope which had never left his custody? The Orrery letters prove that both parts of the correspondence were at Twickenham in 1737. If stolen at all, the collection must necessarily have been stolen in England. The subsequent history of the publication confirms this view. In 1740 Swift received from Bath a printed copy of his correspondence with Pope, together with an anonymous letter, stating that the impression was printed by an admirer of the Dean’s virtues, and urging him to make it public. Swift probably thought it useless to refuse, as the letters were already in the hands of printers. He

sent the English impression to Faulkner, a Dublin bookseller, to be reprinted. Faulkner, who always believed that Pope sent the printed copy and anonymous letter to Swift, refused to print till he had received Pope's authorisation. Thus even the Dublin edition was sanctioned by the authors. Whether Pope sent the copy or not, he profited by the effect produced. He published his rival edition of 1741 as a measure of self-defence. His edition exactly followed that of Faulkner; but Faulkner's edition was merely a reprint of a previous impression. Who but Pope could have supplied the materials? Who but Pope could have been the anonymous printer? As in 1735 P. T. produced a printed copy to Curll, so in 1740 an anonymous printed copy was supplied to Faulkner. In both cases Pope repudiated, but reprinted, the surreptitious publication. If Pope's original letters to Swift were stolen in Ireland from the Dean's volume in which they were stitched, he was singularly unfortunate, since the same volume contained letters, which no one stole, from all Swift's celebrated friends. Nor in this case could the Irish thief have obtained possession of Swift's letters to Pope, which had never left Twickenham. If they were stolen at all, Pope was four times the victim of a misfortune which befell no other public man. Whether the theft is assumed to have occurred at Dublin or Twickenham, the object is utterly inadequate. It is incredible that such a dangerous crime should be committed in order solely to transmit a single printed copy to the Dean.

The intrinsic merits of Pope's own letters do not repay him for the extraordinary trouble of publication. But the derivative interest of a collection which includes the correspondence of so many brilliant men is undeniable; it would be valuable, if for nothing else, for the stern, sardonic chronicle of Swift's great and gloomy life. Most men are glad sometimes to slip away from the orthodoxy of composition, to don the dressing-gown and slippers of privacy, to relieve their minds in asides to their friends. Pope is an exception. He is always in full dress; his letters are indited to the world; they are universal secrets. 'Written,' says Horace Walpole, 'to everybody, they do not look as if they were written to anybody.' They have not the unstudied charm of Madame de Sévigné; they are not written in the careless tone of easy conversation, but are characterised by the laboured foppery of Balzac. They rarely reveal Pope's real character. They are not unguarded effusions, but studied compositions, carefully revised and polished. He never in his private letters

lays aside the part he played in public. In them he professes his disinterestedness, parades his virtues and integrity, affects contempt for his own poetry, indifference to fame, scorn of the world. Yet there are glimpses of real feeling, passages in which his tenderheartedness, his love for his mother, his interest in Patty Blount, his affection for his friends, his eager hero-worship, break through the crust of his affectation.

The third and concluding period of Pope's life was devoted to ethical poetry and satire. Pope's genius for satire, dimly foreshadowed in the 'Essay on Criticism,' had been fully displayed in the lines on Addison. In February 1721-2 Atterbury wrote asking for 'a complete copy of the verses.' He adds: 'Since you now therefore know where your real strength lies, I hope you will not suffer that talent to lie unemployed. Pope was not slow in following his friend's advice. Two years after the completion of the 'Odyssey' appeared the 'Dunciad.' Pope's own account of the origin of the poem, as given in Savage's preface, is not satisfactory. The Scriblerus Club published the third volume of their 'Miscellanies' in March 1728. It contained, among the pieces, the treatise on 'The Bathos, or the Art of Sinking in Poetry,' in which Pope ridiculed all the poets whom he considered 'eminent in that art.' This general onslaught brought a nest of hornets about his ears. The newspapers for the next half-year were filled with the scurrilities of his assailants. It was in the common interests of humanity that Pope, as he would have it believed, at last retaliated by dragging into the light of day 'these common enemies of mankind.' He poses himself as a Hercules cleansing the Augæan stables of Grub Street. This account of the 'Dunciad' in its present form may be literally true; the natural inference is false. The immediate inspiration of the 'Dunciad' probably was the storm of abuse which the 'Bathos' provoked. But throughout his whole literary life Pope was at war with his brethren. Each successive publication increased the number and virulence of his enemies. In some cases Pope was the aggressor, in others his rapid rise gave the provocation. Most of the libels upon him, which are collected in the 'Testimonies of Authors,' and prefixed to the 'Dunciad,' date from an earlier period than the publication of the 'Bathos.' Long before 1728 the offence had been given and the punishment was in preparation. There is evidence to show that so early as 1720 Pope was engaged on a poem entitled the 'Progress of Dulness,' which was afterwards incorporated

in the 'Dunciad.' Swift's first advice to Pope on the subject of his satire was 'to let Gildon and Philips sleep in 'peace.' But later on, perhaps during the visits which he paid to Pope at Twickenham in 1726 and 1727, he urged him to proceed with his 'Dulness.' Towards the end of April 1728 the wild excitement over the 'Beggars' Opera' began to subside. There was 'a vacancy for fame.' On May 28, 1728, 'Dulness' was published under the more pompous title of the 'Dunciad.' Pope proceeded with extraordinary caution. The poem appeared anonymously, without notes or commentary, without even the inscription to Swift, and as a reprint from a Dublin impression. In this imperfect form it ran through five editions. The first complete edition, which Pope, speaking by the card, calls the first edition, was presented to the King by Walpole in March 1729. But Pope's name was still withheld; the fiction was maintained that he was not the author; every precaution was taken to guard against possible actions for libel. In subsequent editions it underwent frequent alterations. It did not assume a final shape till 1742, when Pope added the fourth book, and dethroned Theobald for Cibber. Both changes were unfortunate. The fourth book contains the famous lines on the uncreation of the world by 'Chaos old.' But the splendour of the passage is dimmed by the irrelevant abuse of science and philosophy, and by the blunder which assigned Bentley a place among the Dunces. Equally ill-advised was the dethronement of Theobald and the elevation of Cibber. The lines which fitted Theobald had no application to Cibber, who was in easy circumstances, a man of the world, without any taste for antiquarianism. But he had offended Pope by ridiculing him in a published letter as well as on the stage. Pope's malice was keener than his artistic sense. He sacrificed the 'Dunciad' to gratify his resentment.

Pope's morbid vanity and irritability made him intolerant of criticism, quick to detect or imagine insult. Keenly sensitive of his own deformity he writhed under the unrestrained personalities of those who mocked at his misfortune. 'The libel'd person and the pictur'd shape' were the easy jest of every coarse assailant. He winced under the meanest blow; the most contemptible affront rankled in his mind. Treasuring up all his insults, real or imaginary, he brooded over them till they assumed gigantic proportions. Unable to laugh at the assaults of his enemies, he retaliated in kind. The 'Dunciad' is the matured, carefully executed plan by which the keenest of satirists gratifies his long-hoarded

vengeance. Written by Pope under the influence of such feelings, it could not fail to be, what it unquestionably is, a very great satire.

The idea of the 'Empire of Dulness' is not original; it is borrowed from Dryden's 'MacFlecknoe.' But Theobald and Cibber are raised on 'a gorgeous seat' which far outshines 'Flecknoe's Irish throne.' Pope had already shown his talent for mock heroic verse. His labours of the past ten years had increased his power of travestying epic grandeur. He was still a stranger to the Homeric spirit; but it was easier for him to imitate its tone. Mr. Courthope is a warm admirer of the 'Dunciad.' He says: 'The felicity of invention which assigns to each of the multitude of Dunces his place and order in the Temple of Infamy, the propriety of the parodies, the strength, vividness, and at times the grandeur of the imagery, the terseness of the language, and the harmony of the verse, must cause all genuine lovers of poetry to subordinate their sense of the faults of the poem to their sense of its overpowering excellences.'* That a poem written a century and a half ago should still glow with the white heat of Pope's passion is a marvellous testimony to the greatness of the satire. The biographical and social value of the poem may also be admitted. Yet in our opinion the 'Dunciad' hardly repays the perusal of ordinary readers. The obscurity of the persons satirised has settled down upon the poem. To read it with pleasure requires a minute knowledge of the period which is possessed by few. Mr. Courthope's excellent preface and notes cannot compensate for the incessant distraction of finding the key to unlock the sense of the allusions. The artistic defects of the poem are considerable. It lives by its personality. But nowhere can Pope appeal so little to the promptings of the 'satiric heart;' nowhere is the disguise of moral indignation so thinly worn, or the pettiness of petty squabbles so obviously mean. The objects of his hate are mostly unknown except as Pope's victims. Not even the 'amber' of his verse can give beauty to the 'dirt and grubs and worms' which the 'Dunciad' contains. To immortalise the scum of events and persons is a prostitution of genius. Nor will anything excuse the obscenity of portions of the poem. Pope's apology only makes the matter worse, for it betrays a consciousness of his own shamelessness. The 'Dunciad' is Rabelaisian in its coarseness, but not in its humour. In

* Vol. iv. p. 23.

'Gargantua' and 'Pantagruel' the filth is flung about with boisterous enjoyment; but in the 'Dunciad' the broad laugh of the curé of Meudon is replaced by Pope's grin of malice. The punishment is revolting in its severity. 'We give laws,' said St. John, arguing for the attainder of Stafford, 'to hares and deer, because they are beasts of chase: but we give none to wolves and foxes, but knock them on the head wherever they are found, because they are beasts of prey.' On this principle Pope acted. He calls his opponents 'universal enemies of mankind,' and treats them as vermin without justice or mercy. He degrades himself to their own level. Not even their poverty is spared, but he sneers at their garrets and starvation. Such taunts recoil on the head of the giber. 'Why,' it may be asked with St. John, 'should he have law himself who would not that others should have any?' The great merits of the 'Dunciad' are indisputable; but they are outweighed by the inhumanity of the satire, the pettiness of the personality, the obscurity of the allusions, the filth of the images.

Pope's next work, 'The Essay on Man,' was written to gratify not his own but the public taste. Bolingbroke, who had returned from France in 1734 a shallow but specious philosopher, was anxious to obtain for his ideas the brilliant setting which might pass off the paste as diamonds. He urged Pope to write an ethical poem. The suggestion pleased Pope, because he knew that natural religion was the absorbing topic of contemporary discussion. In the search for truth there may have been more curiosity than earnestness, but the interest of the day was concentrated on the origin of evil, the moral order of the world, the ends of Providence. It was as caterer to the popular taste, rather than purveyor of his friend's philosophy that Pope began the Essay. The first epistle was published anonymously in February 1733; the second and third in April of the same year; the fourth, with Pope's name attached, in January 1734. The Essay is only part of a larger poem, planned on a more extensive scale than Pope had patience to execute. 'The first book, you know,' he told Spence, 'of my ethic work is on the Nature of Man. The second would have been on Knowledge and its limits. Here would have come in an Essay on Education, part of which I have inserted in the "Dunciad." The third was to have treated of Government, both ecclesiastical and civil. The fourth would have been on Morality, in eight or nine of the most concerning branches of it, four of which would have been the

‘two extremes to each of the cardinal virtues.’ Of this scheme nothing was completed but the ‘*Essay on Man*’ and the fourth book of the ‘*Dunciad*,’ unless the *Moral Essays* are treated as a portion of the concluding book.

The *Essay* was a work for which Pope was mentally unfitted. He had not Dryden’s power of close reasoning, nor had he improved his natural incapacity by logical training. His brilliancy of style disguised even from himself the poverty of the thought. ‘He failed most,’ said Fox, ‘in sense: he seldom knew what he meant to say.’ For the topics of the poem he is indebted partly to the conversation of Bolingbroke, partly to such books as the ‘*Théodicée*’ of Leibnitz, Shaftesbury’s ‘*Characteristics*,’ Archbishop King’s ‘*Origin of Evil*.’ The arguments are swept together from opposite quarters, from Pascal and La Rochefoucauld, Mandeville and Locke, Hooker and Hobbes. Even had he possessed the robustness of intellect or width of reading requisite for the subject, his method of working was fatal to consistency. He adopted some general theory, polished it to perfection, and laid it aside for another, perhaps contradictory, principle, which was subjected to the same process, and cut and shaped to the best advantage. The united fragments might be self-destructive, but such considerations did not affect Pope. He was more concerned to string together a chain of brilliants than of reasoning. A sparkling gem was not rejected for a flaw in the argument. Hence the ‘*Essay on Man*’ contains no central principle. It is a maze without a plan. Though full of forcible passages, instances of Pope’s unrivalled power of concise expression, it is a medley of conflicting theories which no ingenuity can reconcile. Crousaz denounced the *Essay* as a noxious system of fatalism; Bolingbroke regarded it as an exposition of his own Deism; Warburton proved its statements orthodox. It is difficult to discover what was Pope’s own purpose, or how far he was the unconscious instrument of Bolingbroke. Probably he had not formulated his own religious beliefs. He never wholly identified God with nature, or lost sight of the intervention of a personal Being in the daily life of man. If God was less to him than an all-wise loving Father, He was more than an all-pervading force or a vague abstraction. Lord Chesterfield, who found a Bible on Pope’s table, asked him whether he was writing an answer to it, but the presence of the book proves as much in one direction as the question does in the other. Pope was neither Pantheist, nor sceptic, nor orthodox theologian,

but something of each. From arguments so inconsistent as those assembled in the 'Essay on Man,' no safe conclusion can be drawn as to his belief. The absence of allusion to the sanctions of Christianity, the reward of heaven, the punishment of hell, were at the time much insisted upon; but, in fact, such topics are excluded from his scheme. Mr. Elwin with the utmost success demolishes Pope's logic, but he also charges him with studiously using language capable of a loyal and a treasonable meaning. Such a charge implies that Pope possessed to an eminent degree the very faculty in which Mr. Elwin proves him deficient. Mr. Elwin will not allow Pope to save his character even at the expense of his understanding.

In 'The Design,' prefixed to the Essay, Pope explains his choice of verse. Not only are precepts, so enforced, more striking and easily remembered, but he found he could attain more conciseness than in prose. Mr. Elwin says 'the alleged choice was necessity. His meagre knowledge would have been ludicrous in a formal treatise. The ceremonious robe of verse was essential to conceal the deformed and diminutive body.*' Apart from the unworthy sneer at Pope's physical misfortune, the comment assumes that Pope was aware of the flimsy insufficiency of his philosophy. The assumption seems unfounded. Pope regarded the Essay with satisfaction as his greatest achievement. It is true that he had selected a theme which could only be adequately treated in prose, in the most precise language, with the closest reasoning. The task of satisfying the inconsistent claims of logic and verse was impossible. It is true, also, that he had over-estimated his own strength, miscalculated his speculative power. But results prove that his choice of verse was wise. It is only the form that has kept his arguments alive. 'Who now reads Bolingbroke?' asked Burke, a century ago. Who now, of the thousands that read the 'Essay on Man,' read it for Pope's incoherent exposition of the sophistries of an exploded philosophy?

The treatment, like the subject, was dictated by contemporary taste. The appeal, throughout, is to common sense. Had Pope dealt with the great problems on which he touches, suggestively, or even devotionally, the Essay might have been poetical. But instead of suggestion he offers proof; for devotion he substitutes experience. The theme is not intractable, but the treatment is prosaic. On the

* Vol. ii. p. 331.

other hand, Pope never writes in that style which Voltaire pronounced wholly bad, the *genre ennuyeux*. His ethics are trite, his reflections commonplace, the coherency of the parts is broken, the conclusions are ill-founded, but the Essay is never dull. As Johnson said of the 'Divine Legation': 'The table is always full, sir. He brings things from the north and the south, and from every quarter. He carries you round and round without carrying you forward to the point, but you have no wish to be carried forward.' Pope failed, if he ever attempted, to build up his philosophy into a solid structure. Whether from design or necessity, he neglected the logical for the rhetorical association of ideas. But if the sequence of thought were closer, the Essay would have fewer readers; logicians would not be reconciled to verse, lovers of poetry would close the Essay in despair.

The 'Moral Essays' mark the transition between Pope's ethical and political compositions. His 'guide, philosopher, and friend' fired him with the philosophical ambition which had inspired Virgil and Propertius. But his speculative interests were not permanent; they were overpowered by the more exciting passions of political partisanship. The 'Moral Essays' also fall naturally into their place after the 'Essay on Man.' Pope's plan of a great philosophical poem was developed in theory as it was abandoned in execution. The system of ethics in the Horatian way which Bolingbroke suggested to him in 1729, assumed elaborate shape in the hands of Warburton. He persuaded Pope to treat his fragmentary efforts as parts of a well-meditated design, and the 'Moral Essays' as detached portions of the concluding book of a 'Greater Essay on Man.' The suggestion flattered Pope's vanity, by crediting him with powers of systematic thought. It also formed a framework in which to fit some of his miscellaneous poems. But except for the common principle of the ruling passion, the 'Moral Essays' are unconnected with one another or the 'Essay on Man.' The dates and order of publication prove the theory of general design a convenient afterthought. Mr. Courthope groups together under the title of 'Moral Essays' the four moral essays, and the six epistles to Oxford, Craggs, Addison, Jervas, and Miss Blount. This classification is a return from the order adopted by previous editors to the arrangement and title followed in the 1743 edition, the last which was prepared in the lifetime of Pope.

Of the four 'Moral Essays,' the first is the worst; it contains more philosophy and less observation than its successors.

Throughout the greater part, Pope repeats the commonplace thoughts of the 'Essay on Man.' He is out of his element. The falseness of his position shows itself in the constraint of his language and the harshness of his versification. But, having established his principle, that the master-key of conduct, the 'open sesame' of motive, is the Ruling Passion, he throws off the disguise of a philosopher, and appears in his natural part of a shrewd observer and brilliant delineator of human life. His assured position restores his ease of manner, grace, and liveliness of style. He regains his unrivalled power of saying most in fewest words. The last hundred lines are in his happiest manner. The skill is exquisite which works up the elaborate portrait of Wharton with an ascending series of pointed contrasts, or sketches Narcissa or Euclio with touches so light, and apparently careless, that only the general effect betrays their vigour and deliberation.

The remaining Essays reproduce the beauties, with less of the blemish, of the first. Bolingbroke considered the 'Epistle on the Character of Women' to be Pope's masterpiece. It was published in February 1734-5, with the Advertisement that no one character in it was drawn from the life. This was at the time true, for the characters of Atossa, Philomede, and Chloe, were inserted later. Silia, Papilia, and the other illustrations, are fancy pictures made up of materials, some of which are observed, some imaginary. Women might justly complain of the poet's contemptuous view of their sex, but for the beautiful lines, as delicate in feeling as they are tender in wisdom, on Martha Blount, with which the poem concludes.

The insertion of the character of Atossa into this Essay raises one of the gravest charges against Pope. Report said that he received 1,000*l.* from the Duchess of Marlborough for the suppression of the lines, which were first published as part of the Essay in 1751. Mr. Courthope treats the question most fully, and arrives at a conclusion which is, if not irresistible, at least probable. The Essay appeared in February, 1734-5, without the lines; but they were already known to some of Pope's intimate friends. Prudence warned Pope to keep them back 'in an age,' as he wrote to Swift, 'so sore of satire and so willing to misapply character.' In 1743 he had corrected for the press an edition of the 'Epistles' in which, for the first time, appeared the character of Atossa. From his death-bed he sent round presentation copies to his old associates, 'like Socrates, distributing 'my morality among my friends.' After Pope's death,

Bolingbroke, writing to Marchmont, speaks of this edition as 'printed off and now ready for publication.' 'I am sorry for it,' he continues, 'because, if he could be excused for writing the character of Atossa formerly, there is no excuse for his design of publishing it after he had received the favour you and I know; and the character of Atossa is inserted.' At his suggestion the edition was suppressed. In 1746 the character was printed on a single folio sheet with the following note:—'These verses are part of a poem entitled "Characters of Women." It is generally said the D——ss gave Mr. P. 1,000*l*. to suppress them; he took the money, yet the world sees the verses! But this is not the first instance where Mr. P.'s practical virtue has fallen very short of those pompous professions of it he makes in his writings.' The point of the note must be the suppressed edition. Who knew the secret, or could gain by its revelation? If the story rested on no other grounds than this anonymous statement, the charge might safely be dismissed. Dilke* does so dismiss it, either as a wilful misrepresentation or as a misapprehension; but the evidence is too strong that Pope did, in 1741 or 1742, receive 1,000*l*. from the Duchess as one of the terms of some bargain between them. The question therefore is, What was the bargain, and did it relate to the lines on Atossa?

Whether Pope received a bribe or not, it is unlikely that he ever intended to publish the lines on Atossa as a portrait of the Duchess of Marlborough in her lifetime. While she lived, he was deterred by the same motives which led him to keep back the lines in 1734. Since 1735 she had humoured Pope, and, as he told Swift, paid him 'great court.' Her dislike to Walpole had drawn her closely to the Opposition; her wealth was at their disposal. Prudence, friendly feelings, and party spirit, which with Pope was a passion, induced him to withhold the publication. It is, however, almost certain that Pope, between 1741 and 1742, received money from the Duchess as part of a bargain, which may or may not have expressly related to the character of Atossa. If Pope's side of the compact was the suppression of the lines, it is incredible that he should have prepared them for publication with any reference to the Duchess. He had held them back for eight years. During any part of that time he might have published them honestly. To defer publication till he had received hush-money was to

* Papers of a Critic, vol. i. pp. 226–33.

adopt not only a treacherous but a ruinous course. Formerly the only consequence of publication was a woman's resentment; now the inevitable result was the proclamation of his own infamy. Nor would so shrewd a woman as the Duchess have paid 1,000*l.* for nothing. The surrender of a single copy of the obnoxious verses would not suffice. Nothing less than the strictest proof of the terms of so costly a bargain would be required. In 1743 the Duchess was alive. If the bargain related to Atossa, she held the damning evidence in her hands. It is incredible that Pope, whose life was one frantic struggle to build up his 'moral reputation, dear to him 'as his literary fame,' should recklessly risk the whole on a cast in which he had so little to gain. The bargain did not expressly relate to Atossa, and when Pope prepared to publish the character, he was also prepared to assert that the Duchess was not the original of the portrait.

The terms of the bargain between Pope and the Duchess probably were, as Mr. Courthope suggests, a general immunity for the Duke and Duchess from Pope's satire. He removed from his letters passages reflecting on Blenheim and its owners; he erased the name of the Duchess who had won Cleland's money at Tunbridge; he omitted from the first Moral Essay the accusation that Marlborough received commissions from army clothiers and bread contractors. In the 'Essay on Man' he suppressed the character, as he told Spence, 'of a very great man who had everything from 'without to make him happy, and yet was very miserable 'from the want of virtue in his own heart.' It was against such passages that the Duchess secured herself and her husband's memory. In her own mind, the Duchess doubtless included in the compact the lines on Atossa. But the verses had been read to her with the solemn assurance that they were not her portrait. She was too proud to recognise the likeness by expressly insisting on their suppression, or to disbelieve Pope's statement that they were meant for the Duchess of Buckinghamshire. Pope flattered his vanity by publishing the lines, and salved his conscience by a few dexterous touches which made the character applicable to the natural daughter of James II., and sister of the Pretender. The name Atossa, the daughter of Cyrus and sister of Cambyzes, thus becomes a well-chosen name. The Duchess of Buckinghamshire, a divorced wife, daughter of an exiled king, sister of a claimant to a throne, spent her life in 'one warfare upon earth.' With Pope's assistance 'she exposed a knave,' by the conviction for forgery of

Ward, M.P. for Plymouth. Her pride and violent temper were notorious. She was under obligations to Pope, but quarrelled with him. Her piety was more ostentatious than practical. She was perpetually engaged in litigation over the will of her late husband. She had had five children, but none survived her. An heir-at-law was found by a trial at bar. She had just died at the age of sixty-one. The resemblances were sufficiently striking to enable Pope to maintain that Atossa was meant for the Duchess of Buckinghamshire. His death ruined his plan. Bolingbroke found in the edition prepared for publication the character of Atossa. Well knowing for whom it was originally intended, he was struck with Pope's ingratitude. The edition of 1743 was suppressed because Atossa had once been the Duchess of Marlborough. It was on this ground that Warburton consented to its suppression. His mouth was therefore closed. He could only insinuate in a note, what Pope would have confidently affirmed, that the lines marked out the Duchess of Buckinghamshire 'in such a manner as not to be mistaken for another.' Here the matter would have probably rested, but for Bolingbroke's indignation at the 'superstitious zeal' with which Pope had prepared an edition of the 'Patriot King.' Pope could have had no other motive than that of preserving a work, as he thought, of the highest genius. He had, however, altered the text according to his taste. Bolingbroke was furious at the discovery. Eager to revenge himself, he seized every opportunity to blacken Pope's memory. Mr. Courthope plausibly conjectures that the publication of the folio sheet in 1746 was the work of his agent, Mallet. Few persons, besides Bolingbroke, knew the secret to which the note alludes, and he alone was interested in its revelation.

The last two Moral Essays on the 'Use of Riches' were not originally published as connected parts of the same subject. The fourth Epistle appeared in December 1731, as an essay on 'False Taste;' the third in January 1732 with the title on the 'Use of Riches.' The change was made partly in pursuance of Warburton's suggestion, partly as a defence against the charge of libelling the Duke of Chandos. By coupling the two Epistles together under the same title, Pope gave them the appearance of parts of the same essay, exhibiting the follies of avarice and profusion. His chief illustration of the former vice was the imaginary character of Sir Balaam; it would seem therefore probable that the chief

illustration of the latter was also imaginary. No individual was intended, but 'a hundred smart in Timon and in Balaam.' The introduction into the Epistle of the line, 'Thus gracious Chandos is beloved at sight,' completed his defence. If Timon was intended for the duke, it was a pointed attack on a man whom the poet, in another part of the same poem, had highly eulogised. Pope's equivocations weakened his cause. Even if Timon was drawn from the life, Pope can hardly be charged 'with ingratitude and treachery.' At the most the offence was in bad taste. His acquaintance with the duke was of the slightest. The duke had subscribed to the *Homer*; but a matter of business leaves no obligation on either side. Though he had entertained Pope at Canons, the duke's character justifies the belief that he extended to the man of letters rather the patronage of a superior than the hospitality of a friend. There were thousands—

'Who to the Dean and silver bell could swear,
And saw at Canons what was never there.'

But the materials of the portrait were gathered for no single person or place. Pope's genuine vexation, when the duke was recognised as the original of Timon, seem to show that the portrait was more typical than particular, and that no personal malice flavoured the satire. Mr. Courthope is right in attributing the real motive of the composition to 'poetic effect. . . . Pope's design as a moralist was to present the ideal man of false magnificence, as Theophrastus might have painted him in his characters, but wishing, as a poet, to make his creation appear as real as possible, he coloured it with actual experiences collected from many different quarters.' *

The association of the two Epistles under one title leaves the artistic merits of each untouched. It is otherwise with another alteration. The third Epistle originally appeared as a letter addressed to Lord Bathurst. But Warburton advised Pope to recast it in the form of a dialogue. In an evil hour Pope consented. The argument gains nothing in clearness; the philosophical defects are paraded; the familiar grace of the letter is sacrificed, and not replaced by the colloquial ease of conversation. Lord Bathurst naturally complained of the 'shabby and indifferent figure' he makes when he only opens his mouth to contradict himself. The third Essay has some of the faults of the first. The abstract

principles are neither sound nor novel; but their embodiment in concrete form, the illustration of the truths by example, is Pope's peculiar gift. Villiers, 'dying in the worst inn's worst room,' 'sad Sir Balaam' cursing God in death, Cutler's wretched life and wretched end, are unsurpassed even by Pope himself.

In the Epistles and Satires, which are grouped together under the collective title of 'Horatian Imitations,' philosophy disappears. Pope in early life held aloof from politics. But his independence was secured by the success of his translations; the Opposition, once disorganised and dispirited, rallied round Bolingbroke and Pulteney; Pope threw himself into their cause with enthusiasm. The new recruit was a valuable ally. His skill in the management of his weapon was complete, and its edge was of the keenest. He was far more than a satirist; but in the mortality of the wound he inflicts, the exquisite polish and temper of his blade are disregarded. The place and title of the 'Prologue, or Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot,' and of the Epilogue, or two dialogues, which originally appeared under the title of '1738,' are due to the ingenuity of Warburton. They are unconnected, except in name, with the Horatian Imitations.

The 'Prologue' is an apologetic autobiography of Pope, an 'apologia pro vitâ suâ.' Its immediate origin was the joint attack of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Lord Hervey. Pope endeavours to gain credit for forbearance under repeated provocation by the Advertisement: 'the paper,' he says, 'is a bill of complaint begun many years since and drawn up by snatches, as the several occasions offered.' The statement is characteristic. As a whole the poem was directly called forth by the onslaught of Hervey. It answers a particular attack. But separate sketches, such as those of Addison and Halifax, were composed many years before. These form no integral portion of the scheme; they are not closely connected with the context; they interrupt the autobiographical apology. Though the transitions are ingeniously contrived, the continuity of the design is broken. Pope's Advertisement is true in detail, but false in general impression. Yet the extreme beauty of the fragments reconcile us to irregularities of structure. The old material is built into the new fabric with admirable skill; where every line is so highly finished, the inferiority of the whole to parts disappears. Pope follows the same disjointed method of composition which he pursued in the 'Essay on Man.' But as the texture of the Epistle is slighter,

it does not so imperatively need cohesion. He has triumphed over the difficulties of his method, and produced, not a patchwork of incompatible ideas but a mosaic of harmonised colours.

He surrounds his own life with the halo of complacent self-esteem. The softened light in which he sees himself is in marked contrast to the naked clearness with which the failings of his enemies are revealed to his intense gaze. In the lines on Addison and Hervey he exerts all his power as a satirist. Hatred never blinds him; it only sharpens his vision to preternatural acuteness. He detects instinctively his opponent's weakness, aims his stroke with cool deliberation, and his thrust is deadly. In his character of Hervey every muscle is stretched to wound and mutilate. The punishment may be merited, but the malignity with which it is inflicted creates sympathy for the victim. Here is no stern indignation of the moral censor, but the venom of the private foe. Pope falls, to use his own distinction, from the satirist to the libeller. On the chastisement of Hervey the poem really turns. Addison's character is one of the older fragments. The picture seems to have mellowed in the keeping. To it, among all the brilliant portraits of Pope's satiric gallery, the eye instinctively turns as his masterpiece. The weaknesses and failings of Addison are unsparingly exposed, but in a tone of regretful tenderness. The picture wins upon us by the artful admixture of praise; its colours are subdued and harmonious; whether like or unlike, it is intensely human. The conviction steals over us that it is the man himself. At a first glance the effect of the companion picture of Hervey is tremendous. But the colouring is harsh. There may be no detail absolutely distorted, no one feature conspicuously exaggerated; but the whole drawing is false, the general effect untrue. Unless there can be a man and a monster under one gaberdine, it is not Hervey.

Personal hatred inspires the Prologue, party spirit the Epilogue. The indignation of pique or faction is not of the highest order; but as a motive power none can deny its fiery force. Satire, so inspired, has no vague generalities, no universal denunciations of abstract immorality. It is intense, real, concentrated. Pope's end is often mean, his aim unjust, his judgment perverse; but there is in his satire a depth of passion, a thirsty gasp for vengeance, which gives undying interest even to his most ephemeral jealousies or factious pettiness. The form of the Epilogue, or '1738,' is

that of two dialogues between Pope and his friend. In the first his friend remonstrates with him on the impolitic severity, in the second on the personal malignity, of his satire. In both Pope rises to a splendid burst of eloquence which has the genuine ring of sincerity. There may be self-delusion, there can hardly be hypocrisy, in the magnificent passages on the triumph of vice or the praise of satire. It is not triumphant Vice in the abstract which the poet sees when,

‘ In golden chains the willing world she draws,
And hers the gospel is, and hers the laws,
Mounts the tribunal, lifts her scarlet head,
And sees pale Virtue carted in her stead,’

but Vice in the concrete form of Walpole’s administration; nor is it the general power of victorious evil, but corruption personified in the Whig Government, which drags the genius of England in the dust at her chariot wheels. So again, the poet cheats himself into the belief that his personal satire is animated by antipathy to wrong, by the strong repulsion of his nature to moral evil. He convinces himself that his is the ‘heaven-directed mind,’ his the reverent hand, his the honest zeal, to which the gods entrust the

‘ Sacred weapon, left for truth’s defence,
Sole dread of folly, vice, and insolence.’

The purity of his motives is the unsubstantial fiction of a dream; but for the moment Pope’s illusion is as complete as if the impression were created by the lasting reality of a waking vision.

The Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, and ‘1738,’ are not inappropriately arranged as the prologue and epilogue to the Horatian Imitations. No one in passing from one to the other would detect the change from English to Roman soil. So nationalised is the classic garb, so slight and loosely worn the Horatian robe, that their presence is scarcely felt. Whether the idea of imitating Horace was suggested by Bolingbroke, or taken from the example afforded by Rochester, Pope’s gifts shine pre-eminently in this class of literature. The social topics of the Imitations are his peculiar element. The monotonous regularity of his verse and the balanced structure of his sentences are relieved by variety of topic. He is never so completely at his ease as in the exercise of his tact of witty passing talk, and of his power of expressing lightly the light things of society. His style, in its glitter and sparkle, is exactly adapted to represent the

surface of life. No one excels him in the 'finesse' of language or graceful ease with which he touches contemporary events. If Johnson is right, the unlearned reader has the advantage over the scholar. The Imitations have all the attractions of Pope's original writings; but the 'man of learning' is shocked by 'the irreconcilable dissimilitude between Roman images and English manners.' Such is not, however, the general opinion of scholars. The pain of strained applications or incongruities of thought is altogether outweighed by the charm of classical associations, the delight of ingenious parallels, dexterous turns, felicitous renderings. Yet not only is Pope's finished elegance strongly opposed to Horace's studied negligence, but in tone and feeling the Imitations differ widely from the original Satires and Epistles. Horace and Pope had some points of union. They speak for the same social class; they are both, in their way, masters of the art of social poetry. Both had sufficient for their wants, boasted justly of the simplicity of their tastes, offered their potluck or their broccoli and mutton with the same hospitality. The ease with which Pope adapts the autobiographical allusions of Horace show that so far they were in sympathy. Both lived among the great, enjoyed the friendship of ministers, took the same keen pleasure in their participation in the secrets of great events. But one of the bitternesses of Pope's successful life was the peculiarity of his political position. In his struggling youth he was the friend of statesmen in power; in his independent age he belonged to the least powerful section of a disunited Opposition. The Imitations seemed to enforce the contrast. His was not the genial nature to enjoy as a bystander the world's spectacle in which he had once been almost an actor. All his tenderness is for the past; all his malevolence for the present. Such a retrospective mood is uncongenial to the light-hearted worldliness of Horace. Equally alien to the Latin is the bitterness of party spirit which Pope adds to his regretful envy. A partisan with a political mission is not fitted to preach the gospel of Epicureanism. It is impossible to conceive Horace writing Pope's bitterly ironical address to Augustus: his 'sly insinuating style' never risked prosecution for an attack upon rulers. Nor could Pope dismiss from his mind the deep problems of life and death, good and evil, with Horatian equanimity. Questions which Horace waved aside with the true philosophy of calm, Pope tried to account for and explain. They harassed and perplexed his mind: he was too earnest to be indifferent,

too devotional in feeling to attain the imperturbability of scepticism.

Pope's satirical writings are the liveliest commentaries on the social and political life of the time. He holds up his mirror to man—

. . . 'in vigour, in the gout;
Alone, in company; in place, or out;
Early at bus'ness, and at hazard late;
Mad at a foxchase, wise at a debate;
Drunk at a borough, civil at a ball;
Friendly at Hackney, faithless at Whitehall.'

Next to personal feeling the strongest motive of his satire is party spirit. By it are dictated his bitter allusions to the King and Queen Caroline, the Court of St. James and its hangers-on. No Whigs are praised unless, like Somers or Harley, they belong to an older school, or, like Chesterfield and Pulteney, were in opposition. His attacks on the clergy whose 'flattery bedropped the Crown,' and his praise of Dissenters, were due rather to his politics than his religion. He sneers at the men of science, the archæologists, bibliomaniacs, and antiquarians, partly because they were encouraged by the Court, but chiefly because they withdrew from political activities and fiddled while Rome was burning. Even his musical taste was regulated by his politics; he preferred Handel to Senesino, because the former was decried by the Whig nobility. He hated the moneyed classes, the Whig millionaires, 'the city's best good men,' as bulwarks of Walpole, Whiggery, and Protestantism. To them he attributed the mania for gambling speculations, the frauds of the Charitable Corporation or the York Building Company, and the consequent financial disturbances which led to Atterbury's exile, and the extra taxation of the Catholics. All his friends belonged to the Opposition; debauchees like Oxenden are freed from the pillory of his verse by joining his faction. The cries of the 'patriots' against the Court are echoed in his satire. He denounces the excise and standing armies, insinuates the sacrifice of English to Hanoverian interests, declaims against the tame foreign policy through which 'Spain 'robs on and Dunkirk's still a port,' attacks the open bribery of Walpole's system of management as the betrayal of the country. He sneers at the poverty of Grub Street pamphleteers and journalists, not so much because it is a crime, as because it is the excuse of 'spurgalled hackneys' for enlistment in the service of the Crown. As George II. had been the centre of opposition when heir-apparent, so the

Prince of Wales was now set up against his father, and Pope, who despised kings, could not praise princes too highly. The unfinished satire, '1740,' proclaims the collapse of Bolingbroke's party. Dissatisfied with the lukewarmness of the Opposition Whigs, they distrust Pulteney's vacillation, and suspect that 'he foams a patriot, to subside a peer.' Bolingbroke returned to France; the secession from the House of Commons failed; the Tory squires sat still and wished for Walpole's death. Pope himself could only look forward to the accession of a young Marcellus of the House of Stuart or of Hanover.

His world had narrowed; he paid the penalty of precocity. His early friends belonged to a previous generation, which he naturally survived. Bolingbroke and Swift, indeed, remained. Bolingbroke was with him during his last illness, but Swift was 'dying like a poisoned rat in a hole.' His own health broke up rapidly. Disorders accumulated; dropsical asthma set in, for which he vainly consulted Dr. Thomson, a notorious quack. Neither the skill of Cheselden nor the care of Martha Blount could aid him. He died in the evening of the 30th of May, 1744, after receiving the sacraments of the Roman Church. Chesterfield and Bolingbroke might sneer at his sacrifice of a cock to Æsculapius, or his certainty of the immortality of the soul, but Pope was, after his fashion, a religious man.

The inconsistencies of his moral character necessarily expose him to one-sided estimates. Nothing will dignify the pettiness of his malice, or palliate the frauds of his career. Yet his life was a gallant struggle against odds, ennobled by frequent generosity. The man who tended his parents with untiring devotion, sheltered his ancient nurse, pensioned his worthless schoolmaster, remembered friends of his youth like Southcote, assisted Mrs. Cope, championed the cause of Mrs. Weston, helped the children of his half-sister, befriended Savage, aided Dodsley, encouraged Johnson, cannot have been wholly false or malignant. His insatiable vanity was coupled with unselfish enthusiasm for the talents of his friends. Thrown back upon himself by a religion which was alien to that of the nation, by deformity, by sickly health, his natural sensitiveness became morbid. The self-torture of such a temperament was keener than any wound he inflicted on others, more deserving of pity than contempt. The one solace of the 'long disease' his life was literary fame; when this is considered, his craving for appreciation ceases to be ridiculous and grows pathetic. His

patriotism, if mistaken, was at least ardent. He raised the profession of letters by his independence of aristocratic and political patronage. Our view of his literary position has been sufficiently indicated. He represented the merits as well as the faults of his age, the lack of enthusiasm, the coarseness, the artificiality as well as the brilliancy and common sense. He was not one of those poets whose sweet influence 'makes rich the blood of the world.' Yet he wielded his power as a satirist for good rather than evil. If his moral scorn is weaker than his malice, if he attacks not vice but the vicious individual, he 'strengthens the hands of virtue.' His knowledge of human nature is scarcely profound. Character, as moulded in the Georgian era, as expressed in the manners of the day, is depicted in his poetry. The peculiarities of ladies and gentlemen of 1730, not the nature of men and women, are his province. He had the bright fancy of a designer rather than the robust imagination of the inventor. Deficient in originality he rarely attempts the highest flights of poetry. To use modern terminology, he had too much of the intelligence of the Greek, too little of the Hebrew fire. His productions are the work of indefatigable art, not of prodigal nature; but they bear the stamp of perfect style and exquisite finish. His gift is the 'learned sock' of Jonson, not the 'wood-notes wild' of Shakespeare; his genius is less a divine possession than the offspring of patience.

- ART. II.—1. *Mountain Observatories*. By E. C. PICKERING. 'The Observatory,' No. 78. London: 1883.
2. *The Mount Whitney Expedition*. By S. P. LANGLEY. 'Nature,' vol. xxvi. London: 1882.
3. *Observations on Mount Etna*. By S. P. LANGLEY. 'The American Journal of Science,' vol. xx. Newhaven: 1880.
4. *An Account of some recent Astronomical Experiments at High Elevations in the Andes*. By RALPH COPELAND, Ph.D. Reprinted from "Copernicus." Dublin: 1884.

ON October 1, 1876, one of the millionaires of the New World died at San Francisco. Although owning a no more euphonious name than James Lick, he had contrived to secure a future for it. He had founded and endowed the first great astronomical establishment planted on the heights,

between the stars and the sea. How he came by his love of science we have no means of knowing. Born obscurely at Fredericksburg, in Pennsylvania, August 25, 1796, he amassed some 30,000 dollars by commerce in South America, and in 1847 transferred them and himself to a village which had just exchanged its name of Yerba Buena for that of San Francisco, situate on a long, sandy strip of land between the Pacific and a great bay. In the hillocks and gullies of that wind-blown barrier he invested his dollars, and never did virgin soil yield a richer harvest. The gold-fever broke out in the spring of 1848. The unremembered cluster of wooden houses, with no trouble or tumult of population in their midst, nestling round a tranquil creek under a climate which, but for a touch of sea-fog, might rival that of the Garden of the Hesperides, became all at once a centre of attraction to the outcast and adventurous from every part of the world. Wealth poured in; trade sprang up; a population of six hundred increased to a quarter of a million; hotels, villas, public edifices, places of business spread, mile after mile, along the bay; building-ground rose to a fabulous price, and James Lick found himself one of the richest men in the United States.

Thus he got his money; we have now to see how he spent it. Already the munificent benefactor of the learned institutions of California, he in 1874 formally set aside a sum of two million dollars for various public purposes, philanthropic, patriotic, and scientific. Of these two millions, 700,000 were appropriated to the erection of a telescope 'superior to, and 'more powerful than any ever yet made.' But this, he felt instinctively, was not enough. Even in astronomy, although most likely unable to distinguish the Pole-star from the Dog-star, this 'pioneer citizen' could read the signs of the times. It was no longer instruments that were wanted; it was the opportunity of employing them. Telescopes of vast power and exquisite perfection had ceased to be a rarity; but their use seemed all but hopelessly impeded by the very conditions of existence on the surface of the earth.

The air we breathe is in truth the worst enemy of the astronomer's observations. It is their enemy in two ways. Part of the light which brings its wonderful, evanescent messages across inconceivable depths of space, it stops; and what it does not stop, it shatters. And this even when it is most transparent and seemingly still; when mist-veils are withdrawn, and no clouds curtain the sky. Moreover, the evil grows with the power of the instrument. Atmospheric

troubles are magnified neither more nor less than the objects viewed across them. Thus, Lord Rosse's giant reflector possesses—*nominally*—a magnifying power of 6,000; that is to say, it can reduce the *apparent* distances of the heavenly bodies to $\frac{1}{6000}$ their *actual* amount. The moon, for example, which is in reality separated from the earth's surface by an interval of about 234,000 miles, is shown as if removed only thirty-nine miles. Unfortunately, however, in theory only. Professor Newcomb compares the sight obtained under such circumstances to a glimpse through several yards of running water, and doubts whether our satellite has ever been seen to such advantage as it would be if brought—substantially, not merely optically—within 500 miles of the unassisted eye.*

Must, then, all the growing triumphs of the optician's skill be counteracted by this plague of moving air? Can nothing be done to get rid of, or render it less obnoxious? Or is this an ultimate barrier, set up by Nature herself, to stop the way of astronomical progress? Much depends upon the answer—more than can, in a few words, be easily made to appear; but there is fortunately reason to believe that it will, on the whole, prove favourable to human ingenuity, and the rapid advance of human knowledge on the noblest subject with which it is or ever can be conversant.

The one obvious way of meeting atmospheric impediments is to leave part of the impeding atmosphere behind; and this the rugged shell of our planet offers ample means of doing. Whether the advantages derived from increased altitudes will outweigh the practical difficulties attending such a system of observation when conducted on a great scale, has yet to be decided. The experiment, however, is now about to be tried simultaneously in several parts of the globe.

By far the most considerable of these experiments is that of the 'Lick Observatory.' Its founder was from the first determined that the powers of his great telescope should, as little as possible, be fettered by the hostility of the elements. The choice of its local habitation was, accordingly, a matter of grave deliberation to him for some time previous to his death. Although close upon his eightieth year, he himself spent a night upon the summit of Mount St. Helena with a view to testing its astronomical capabilities, and a site already secured in the Sierra Nevada was abandoned on the

* Popular Astronomy, p. 145.

ground of climatic disqualifications. Finally, one of the culminating peaks of the Coast Range, elevated 4,440 feet above the sea, was fixed upon. Situated about fifty miles south-east of San Francisco, Mount Hamilton lies far enough inland to escape the sea-fog, which only on the rarest occasions drifts upwards to its triple crest. All through the summer the sky above it is limpid and cloudless; and though winter storms are frequent, their raging is not without highly available lucid intervals. As to the essential point—the quality of telescopic vision—the testimony of Mr. S. W. Burnham is in the highest degree encouraging. This well-known observer spent two months on the mountain in the autumn of 1879, and concluded, as the result of his experience during that time—with the full concurrence of Professor Newcomb—that ‘it is the finest observing location in the United States.’ Out of sixty nights he found forty-two as nearly perfect as nights can well be, seven of medium quality, and only eleven cloudy or foggy; * his stay, nevertheless, embraced the first half of October, by no means considered to belong to the choice part of the season. Nor was his trip barren of discovery. A list of forty-two new double stars gave an earnest of what may be expected from systematic work in such an unrivalled situation. Most of these are objects which never rise high enough in the sky to be examined with any profit through the grosser atmosphere of the plains east of the Rocky Mountains; some are well-known stars, not before seen clearly enough for the discernment of their composite character; yet Mr. Burnham used the lesser of two telescopes—a 6-inch and an 18-inch achromatic—with which he had been accustomed to observe at Chicago.

The largest refracting telescope as yet actually completed has a light-gathering surface 27 inches in diameter. This is the great Vienna equatorial, admirably turned out by Mr. Grubb, of Dublin, in 1880, but still awaiting the commencement of its exploring career. It will, however, soon be surpassed by the Pulkowa telescope, ordered more than four years ago on behalf of the Russian Government from Alvan Clark and Sons, of Cambridgeport, Massachusetts. Still further will it be surpassed by the coming ‘Lick Refractor.’ It is safe to predict that the optical championship of the world is, at least for the next few years, secured to this gigantic instrument, the completion of which may

* The Observatory, No. 43, p. 613.

be looked for in the immediate future. It will have a clear aperture of *three feet*. A disc of flint-glass for the object-lens, 38·18 inches across, and 170 kilogrammes in weight, was cast at the establishment of M. Feil, in Paris, early in 1882. Four days were spent and eight tons of coal consumed in the casting of this vast mass of flawless crystal; it took a calendar month to cool, and cost 2,000l.* It may be regarded as the highest triumph so far achieved in the art of optical glass-making.

A refracting telescope three feet in aperture collects rather more light than a speculum of four feet.† In this quality, then, the Lick instrument will have—besides the Rosse leviathan, which, for many reasons, may be considered to be out of the running—but one rival. And over this rival—the 48-inch reflector of the Melbourne observatory—it will have all the advantages of agility and robustness (so to speak) which its system of construction affords; while the exquisite definition for which Alvan Clark is famous will, presumably, not be absent.

Already preparations are being made for its reception at Mount Hamilton. The scabrous summit of ‘Observatory Peak’ has been smoothed down to a suitable equality of surface by the removal of 40,000 tons of hard trap rock. Preliminary operations for the erection of a dome, 75 feet in diameter, to serve as its shelter, are in progress. The water-supply has been provided for by the excavation of great cisterns. Buildings are being rapidly pushed forward from designs prepared by Professors Holden and Newcomb. Most of the subsidiary instruments have for some time been in their places, constituting in themselves an equipment of no mean order. With their aid Professor Holden and Mr. Burnham observed the transit of Mercury of November 7, 1881, and Professor Todd obtained, December 6, 1882, a series of 147 photographs (of which seventy-one were of the highest excellence) recording the progress of Venus across the face of the sun.

We are informed that a great hotel will eventually add

* *Nature*, vol. xxv. p. 537.

† Silvered glass is considerably more reflective than speculum-metal, and Mr. Common’s 36-inch mirror can be but slightly inferior in luminous capacity to the Lick objective. It is, however, devoted almost exclusively to celestial photography, in which it has done splendid service. The Paris 4-foot mirror bent under its own weight when placed in the tube in 1875, and has not since been remounted.

the inducement of material well-being to those of astronomical interest and enchanting scenery. No more delightful summer resort can well be imagined. The road to the summit, of which the construction formed the subject of a species of treaty between Mr. Lick and the county of Santa Clara in 1875, traverses from San José a distance, as a bird flies, of less than thirteen miles, but doubled by the windings necessary in order to secure moderate gradients. So successfully has this been accomplished, that a horse drawing a light waggon can reach the observatory buildings without breaking his trot.* As the ascending track draws its coils closer and closer round the mountain, the view becomes at every turn more varied and more extensive. On one side the tumultuous coast ranges, stooping gradually to the shore, magnificently clad with forests of pine and red cedar; the island-studded bay of San Francisco, and, farther south, a shining glimpse of the Pacific; on the other, the thronging pinnacles of the Sierras—granite needles, lava-topped bastions—fire-rent, water-worn; right underneath, the rich valleys of Santa Clara and San Joaquim, and, 175 miles away to the north (when the sapphire of the sky is purest), the snowy cone of Mount Shasta.

Thus, there seems some reason to apprehend that Mount Hamilton, with its monster telescope, may become one of the show places of the New World. *Absit omen!* Such a desecration would effectually mar one of the fairest prospects opened in our time before astronomy. The true votaries of Urania will then be driven to seek sanctuary in some less accessible and less inviting spot. Indeed, the present needs of science are by no means met by an elevation above the sea of four thousand and odd feet, even under the most translucent sky in the world. Already observing stations are recommended at four times that altitude, and the ambition of the new species of climbing astronomer seems unlikely to be satisfied until he can no longer find wherewith to fill his lungs (for even an astronomer must breathe), or whereon to plant his instruments.

This ambition is no casual caprice. It has grown out of the growing exigencies of celestial observation.

From the time that Lord Rosse's great reflector was pointed to the sky in February, 1845, it began to be distinctly felt that instrumental power had outrun its opportunities. To the sounding of further depths of space it

came to be understood that Atlantic mists and tremulous light formed an obstacle far more serious than any mere optical or mechanical difficulties. The late Mr. Lassell was the first to act on this new idea. Towards the close of 1852 he transported his beautiful 24-inch Newtonian to Malta, and, in 1859-60, constructed, for service there, one of four times its light capacity. Yet the chief results of several years' continuous observation under rarely favourable conditions were, in his own words, 'rather negative than positive.*' He dispelled the 'ghosts' of four Uranian moons which had, by glimpses, haunted the usually unerring vision of the elder Herschel, and showed that our acquaintance with the satellite families of Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune must, for the present at any rate, be regarded as complete; but the discoveries by which his name is chiefly remembered were made in the murky air of Lancashire.

The celebrated expedition to the Peak of Teneriffe, carried out in the summer of 1856 by the present Astronomer Royal for Scotland, was an experiment made with the express object of ascertaining 'how much astronomical observation 'can be benefited by eliminating the lower third or fourth 'part of the atmosphere.'† So striking were the advantages of which it seemed to hold out the promise, that we count with surprise the many years suffered to elapse before any adequate attempt was made to realise them.‡ Professor Piazzi Smyth made his principal station at Guajara, 8,903 feet above the sea, close to the rim of the ancient crater from which the actual peak rises to a further height of more than 3,000 feet. There he found that his equatorial (five feet in focal length) showed stars fainter by *four magnitudes* than at Edinburgh. On the Calton Hill the companion of Alpha Lyræ (eleventh magnitude) could never, under any circumstances, be made out. At Guajara it was an easy object twenty-five degrees from the zenith; and stars of the fourteenth magnitude were discernible. Now, according to the usual estimate, a step downwards from one magnitude to another means a decrease of lustre in the proportion of two to five. A star of the fourteenth order of brightness sends us accordingly only $\frac{1}{32}$ th as much light as an average one of the tenth order. So that, in Professor Smyth's

* Monthly Notices, R. Astr. Soc. vol. xiv. p. 133 (1854).

† Phil. Trans. vol. cxlviii. p. 465.

‡ Captain Jacob unfortunately died August 16, 1862, when about to assume the direction of a hill observatory at Poonah.

judgement, the grasp of his instrument was virtually *multiplied thirty-nine times* by getting rid of the lowest quarter of the atmosphere.* In other words (since light falls off in intensity as the square of the distance of its source increases), the range of vision was more than sextupled, further depths of space being penetrated to an extent probably to be measured by thousands of billions of miles!

This vast augmentation of telescopic compass was due as much to the increased tranquillity as to the increased transparency of the air. The stars hardly seemed to twinkle at all. Their rays, instead of being broken and scattered by continual changes of refractive power in the atmospheric layers through which their path lay, travelled with relatively little disturbance, and thus produced a far more vivid and concentrated impression upon the eye. Their images in the telescope, with a magnifying power of 150, showed no longer the 'amorphous figures' seen at Edinburgh, but such minute, sharply-defined discs as gladden the eyes of an astronomer, and seem, in Professor Smyth's phrase, to 'provoke' (as the 'cocked-hat' appearance surely baffles) 'the application of a 'wire-micrometer' for purposes of measurement.†

The lustre of the milky way and zodiacal light at this elevated station was indescribable, and Jupiter shone with extraordinary splendour. Nevertheless, not even the most fugitive glimpse of any of his satellites was to be had without optical aid.‡ This was possibly attributable to the prevalent 'dust-haze,' which must have caused a diffusion of light in the neighbourhood of the planet more than sufficient to blot from sight such faint objects. The same cause completely neutralised the darkening of the sky usually attendant upon ascents into the more ethereal regions, and surrounded the sun with an intense glare of reflected light. For reasons presently to be explained, this circumstance alone would render the Peak of Teneriffe wholly unfit to be the site of a modern observatory.

* The height of the mercury at Guajara is 21·7 to 22 inches.

† Phil. Trans. vol. cxlviii. p. 477.

‡ We are told that three American observers in the Rocky Mountains, belonging to the Eclipse Expedition of 1878, easily saw Jupiter's satellites night after night with the naked eye. That their discernment is possible even under comparatively disadvantageous circumstances is rendered certain by the well-authenticated instance (related by Humboldt, 'Cosmos,' vol. iii. p. 66, Otte's trans.) of a tailor named Schön, who died at Breslau in 1837. This man habitually perceived the first and third, but never could see the second or fourth Jovian moons.

Within the last thirty years a remarkable change, long in preparation,* has conspicuously affected the methods and aims of astronomy; or, rather, beside the old astronomy—the astronomy of Laplace, of Bessel, of Airy, Adams, and Leverrier—has grown up a younger science, vigorous, inspiring, seductive, revolutionary, walking with hurried or halting footsteps along paths far removed from the staid courses of its predecessor. This new science concerns itself with the *nature* of the heavenly bodies; the elder regarded exclusively their *movements*. The aim of the one is *description*, of the other *prediction*. The younger science inquires what sun, moon, stars, and nebulae are made of, what stores of heat they possess, what changes are in progress within their substance, what vicissitudes they have undergone or are likely to undergo. The elder has attained its object when the theory of celestial motions shows no discrepancy with fact—when the calculus can be brought to agree perfectly with the telescope—when the coursers of the heavens come strictly up to time, and their observed places square to a hair's breadth with their predicted places.

It is evident that very different modes of investigation must be employed to further such different objects; in fact, the invention of novel modes of investigation has had a prime share in bringing about the change in question. Geometrical astronomy, or the astronomy of position, seeks above all to measure with exactness, and is thus more fundamentally interested in the accurate division and accurate centering of circles than in the development of optical appliances. Descriptive astronomy, on the other hand, seeks as the first condition of its existence to *see* clearly and fully. It has no 'method of least squares' for making the best of bad observations—no process for eliminating errors by their multiplication in opposite directions; it is wholly dependent for its data on the quantity and quality of the rays focussed by its telescopes, sifted by its spectroscopes, or printed in its photographic cameras. Therefore, the loss and disturbance suffered by those rays in traversing our atmosphere constitute an obstacle to progress far more serious now than when the exact determination of places was the primary and all-important task of an astronomical observer. This obstacle, which no ingenuity can avail to remove, may be

* Sir W. Herschel's great undertakings, Bessel remarks ('Populäre 'Vorlesungen,' p. 15), 'were directed rather towards a physical description of the heavens, than to astronomy proper.'

reduced to less formidable dimensions. It may be diminished or partially evaded by anticipating the most detrimental part of the atmospheric transit—by carrying our instruments upwards into a finer air—by meeting the light upon the mountains.

The study of the sun's composition, and of the nature of the stupendous processes by which his ample outflow of light and heat is kept up and diffused through surrounding space, has in our time separated, it might be said, into a science apart. Its pursuit is, at any rate, far too arduous to be conducted with less than a man's whole energies; while the questions which it has addressed itself to answer are the fundamental problems of the new physical astronomy. There is, however, but one opinion as to the expediency of carrying on solar investigations at higher altitudes than have hitherto been more than temporarily available.

The spectroscope and the camera are now the chief engines of solar research. Mere telescopic observation, though always an indispensable adjunct, may be considered to have sunk into a secondary position. But the spectroscope and the camera, still more than the telescope, lie at the mercy of atmospheric vapours and undulations. The late Professor Henry Draper, of New York, an adept in the art of celestial photography, stated in 1877 that two years, during which he had photographed the moon at his observatory on the Hudson on every moonlit night, yielded *only three* when the air was still enough to give good results, nor even then without some unsteadiness; and Bond, of Cambridge (U.S.), informed him that he had watched in vain, through no less than seventeen years for a faultless condition of our troublesome environing medium.* Tranquillity is the first requisite for a successful astronomical photograph. The hour generally chosen for employing the sun as his own limner is, for this reason, in the early morning, before the newly emerged beams have had time to set the air in commotion, and so blur the marvellous details of his surface-structure. By this means a better definition is secured but at the expense of transparency. Both are, at the sea-level, hardly ever combined. A certain amount of haziness is the price usually paid for exceptional stillness, so that it not unfrequently happens that astronomers see best in a fog, as on the night of November 15, 1850, when the elder Bond discovered the 'dusky ring' of Saturn,

* Am. Jour. of Science, vol. xiii. p. 89.

although at the time no star below the fourth magnitude could be made out with the naked eye. Now, on well-chosen mountain stations, a union of these unhappily divorced conditions is at certain times to be met with, opportunities being thus afforded with tolerable certainty and no great rarity, which an astronomer on the plains might think himself fortunate in securing once or twice in a lifetime.

For spectroscopic observations at the edge of the sun, on the contrary, the *sine quâ non* is translucency. During the great 'Indian eclipse' of August 18, 1868, the variously coloured lines were, by the aid of prismatic analysis, first descried, which reveal the chemical constitution of the flame-like 'prominences,' forming an ever-varying, but rarely absent, feature of the solar surroundings. Immediately afterwards, M. Janssen, at Guntoor, and Mr. Norman Lockyer, in England, independently realised a method of bringing them into view without the co-operation of the eclipsing moon. This was done by *fanning out* with a powerfully dispersive spectroscope the diffused radiance near the sun, until it became sufficiently attenuated to permit the delicate flame-lines to appear upon its rainbow-tinted background. This mischievous radiance—which it is the chief merit of a solar eclipse to abolish during some brief moments—is due to the action of the atmosphere, and chiefly of the watery vapours contained in it. Were our earth stripped of its 'cloud of all-sustaining air,' and presented, like its satellite, bare to space, the sky would appear perfectly black up to the very rim of the sun's disc—a state of things of all others (vital necessities apart) the most desirable to spectroscopists. The best approach to its attainment is made by mounting a few thousand feet above the earth's surface. In the drier and purer air of the mountains, 'glare' notably diminishes, and the tell-tale prominence-lines are thus more easily disengaged from the effacing lustre in which they hang, as it were, suspended.

The Peak of Teneriffe, as we have seen, offers a marked exception to this rule, the impalpable dust diffused through the air giving, even at its summit, precisely the same kind of detailed reflection as aqueous vapours at lower levels. It is accordingly destitute of one of the chief qualifications for serving as a point of vantage to observers of the new type.

The changes in the spectra of chromosphere and prominences (for they are parts of a single appendage) present a subject of unsurpassed interest to the student of solar

physics. There, if anywhere, will be found the key to the secret of the sun's internal economy; in them, if at all, the real condition of matter in the unimaginable abysses of heat covered up by the relatively cool photosphere, whose radiations could, nevertheless, vivify 2,300,000,000 globes like ours, will reveal itself; revealing, at the same time, something more than we now know of the nature of the so-called 'elementary' substances, hitherto tortured, with little result, in terrestrial laboratories.

The chromosphere and prominences might be figuratively described as an ocean and clouds of tranquil incandescence, agitated and intermingled with waterspouts, tornadoes, and geysers of raging fire. Certain kinds of light are at all times emitted by them, showing that certain kinds of matter (as, for instance, hydrogen and 'helium'*) form invariable constituents of their substance. Of these unfailing lines Professor Young counts eleven.† But a vastly greater number appear only occasionally, and, it would seem, capriciously, under the stress of eruptive action from the interior. And precisely this it is which lends them such significance; for of what is going on there, they have doubtless much to tell, were their message only legible by us. It has not as yet proved so; but the characters in which it is written are being earnestly scrutinised and compared, with a view to their eventual decipherment. The prodigious advantages afforded by high altitudes for this kind of work were illustrated by the brilliant results of Professor Young's observations in the Rocky Mountains during the summer of 1872. By the diligent labour of several years he had, at that time, constructed a list of one hundred and three distinct lines occasionally visible in the spectrum of the chromosphere. In seventy-two days, at Sherman (8,335 feet above the sea), it was extended to 273. Yet the weather was exceptionally cloudy, and the spot (a station on the Union Pacific Railway, in the Territory of Wyoming) not perhaps the best that might have been chosen for an 'astronomical reconnaissance.'‡

A totally different kind of solar research is that in aid of which the Mount Whitney expedition was organised in 1881.

* The characteristic orange line (D_3) of this unknown substance, has recently been identified by Professor Palmieri in the spectrum of lava from Vesuvius—a highly interesting discovery, if verified.

† The Sun, p. 193.

‡ R. D. Cutts, 'Bulletin of the Philosophical Society of Washington,' vol. i. p. 70.

Professor S. P. Langley, director of the Alleghany observatory in Pennsylvania, has long been engaged in the detailed study of the radiations emitted by the sun; inventing, for the purpose of its prosecution, the 'bolometer,'* an instrument twenty times as sensitive to changes of temperature as the thermopile. But the solar spectrum as it is exhibited at the surface of the earth, is a very different thing from the solar spectrum as it would appear could it be formed of sunbeams, so to speak, *fresh from space*, unmodified by atmospheric action. For not only does our air deprive each ray of a considerable share of its energy (the total loss may be taken at 20 to 25 per cent. when the sky is clear and the sun in the zenith), but it deals unequally with them, robbing some more than others, and thus materially altering their relative importance. Now it was Professor Langley's object to reconstruct the original state of things, and he saw that this could be done most effectually by means of simultaneous observations at the summit and base of a high mountain. For the effect upon each separate ray of transmission through a known proportion of the atmosphere being (with the aid of the bolometer) once ascertained, a very simple calculation would suffice to eliminate the remaining effects, and thus virtually secure an extra-atmospheric post of observation.

The honour of rendering this important service to science was adjudged to the highest summit in the United States. The Sierra Nevada culminates in a granite pile, rising, somewhat in the form of a gigantic helmet fronting eastwards, to a height of 14,887 feet. Mount Whitney is thus entitled to rank as the Mont Blanc of its own continent. In order to reach it, a railway journey of 3,400 miles, from Pittsburg to San Francisco, and from San Francisco to Caliente, was a brief and easy preliminary. The real difficulty began with a march of 120 miles across the arid and glaring Inyo

* This instrument may be described as an electric balance of the utmost conceivable delicacy. The principle of its construction is that the conducting power of metals is diminished by raising their temperature. Thus, if heat be applied to one only of the wires forming a circuit in which a galvanometer is included, the movement of the needle instantly betrays the disturbance of the electrical equilibrium. The conducting wires or 'balance-arms' of the bolometer are platinum-strips $\frac{1}{20}$ th of an inch wide and $\frac{1}{3000}$ th of an inch thick, constituting metallic *antennæ* sensitive to the chill even of the fine dark lines in the solar spectrum, or to changes of temperature estimated at $\frac{1}{10000}$ th of a degree Centigrade.

desert, the thermometer standing at 110° in the shade (if shade there were to be found). Towards the end of July 1881, the party reached the settlement of Lone Pine at the foot of the Sierras, where a camp for low-level observations was pitched (at a height, it is true, of close upon 4,000 feet), and the needful instruments were unpacked and adjusted. Close overhead, as it appeared, but in reality sixteen miles distant, towered the gaunt, and rifted, and seemingly inaccessible pinnacle which was the ultimate goal of their long journey. The illusion of nearness produced by the extraordinary transparency of the air was dispelled when, on examination with a telescope, what had worn the aspect of patches of moss, proved to be extensive forests.

The ascent of such a mountain with a train of mules bearing a delicate and precious freight of scientific apparatus, was a perhaps unexampled enterprise. It was, however, accomplished without the occurrence, though at the frequent and imminent risk, of disaster, after a toilsome climb of seven or eight days through an unexplored and, to less resolute adventurers, impassable waste of rocks, gullies, and precipices. Finally a site was chosen for the upper station on a swampy ledge, 13,000 feet above the sea; and there, notwithstanding extreme discomforts from bitter cold, fierce sunshine, high winds, and, worst of all, 'mountain sickness,' with its intolerable attendant debility, observations were determinedly carried on, in combination with those at Lone Pine, and others daily made on the highest crest of the mountain, until September 11. They were well worth the cost. By their means a real extension was given to knowledge, and a satisfactory definiteness introduced into subjects previously involved in very wide uncertainty.

Contrary to the received opinion, it now appeared that the weight of atmospheric absorption falls upon the upper or blue end of the spectrum, and that the obstacles to the transmission of light-waves through the air diminish as their length increases, and their refrangibility consequently diminishes. A yellow tinge is thus imparted to the solar rays by the imperfectly transparent medium through which we see them. And, since the sun possesses an atmosphere of its own, exercising an unequal or 'selective' absorption of the same character, it follows that, if both these dusky-red veils were withdrawn, the true colour of the photosphere would show as a very distinct blue*—not merely *bluish*, but a real

* Defined by the tint of the second hydrogen-line, the bright

azure just tinted with green, like the hue of a mountain lake fed with a glacier stream.

Moreover, the further consequence ensues, that the sun is hotter than had been supposed. For the higher the temperature of a glowing body, the more copiously it emits rays from the violet end of the spectrum. The blueness of its light is, in fact, a measure of the intensity of its incandescence. Professor Langley has not yet ventured (that we are aware of) on an estimate of what is called the 'effective temperature' of the sun—the temperature, that is, which it would be necessary to attribute to a surface of the radiating power of lamp-black to enable it to send us just the quantity of heat that the sun does actually send us. Indeed, the present state of knowledge still leaves an important hiatus—only to be filled by more or less probable guessing—in the reasoning by which inferences on this subject must be formed; while the startling discrepancies between the figures adopted by different, and equally respectable, authorities sufficiently show that none are entitled to any confidence. The amount of heat received in a given interval of time by the earth from the sun is, however, another matter, and one falling well within the scope of observation. This Professor Langley's experiments (when completely worked out) will, by their unequalled precision, enable him to determine with some approach to finality. Pouillet valued the 'solar constant' at 1.7 'calories'; in other words, he calculated that, our atmosphere being supposed removed, vertical sunbeams would have power to heat in each minute of time, by one degree centigrade, 1.7 gramme of water for each square centimetre of the earth's surface. This estimate was raised by Crova to 2.3, and by Violle in 1877 to 2.5; * Professor Langley's new data bring it up (approximately as yet) to 3 calories per square centimetre per minute. This result alone would, by its supreme importance to meteorology, amply repay the labours of the Mount Whitney expedition.

Still more unexpected is the answer supplied to the question: Were the earth wholly denuded of its aëriform covering, what would be the temperature of its surface? We are informed in reply that it would be *at the outside* 50 degrees of Fahrenheit below zero, or 82 of frost. So that mercury would remain solid even when exposed to the rays—un-

reversal of Fraunhofer's F. The sun would also seem—adopting a medium estimate—three or four times as brilliant as he now does.

* *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, t. x. p. 360.

diminished by atmospheric absorption—of a tropical sun at noon.* The paradoxical aspect of this conclusion—a perfectly legitimate and reliable one—disappears when it is remembered that under the imagined circumstances there would be absolutely nothing to hinder radiation into the frigid depths of space, and that the solar rays would, consequently, find abundant employment in maintaining a difference of 189 degrees† between the temperature of the mercury and that of its environment. What we may with perfect accuracy call the *clothing function* of our atmosphere is thus vividly brought home to us; for it protects the teeming surface of our planet against the cold of space exactly in the same way as, and much more effectually than, a lady's sealskin mantle keeps her warm in frosty weather. That is to say, it impedes radiation. Or, again, to borrow another comparison, the gaseous envelope we breathe in (and chiefly the watery part of it) may be literally described as a 'trap for sunbeams.' It permits their entrance (exacting, it is true, a heavy toll), but almost totally bars their exit. It is now easy to understand why it is that on the airless moon no vapours rise to soften the hard shadow-outlines of craters on ridges throughout the fierce blaze of the long lunar day. In immediate contact with space (if we may be allowed the expression) water, should such a substance exist on our enigmatical satellite, must remain frozen, though exposed for endless æons of time to direct sunshine.

Amongst the most noteworthy results of Professor Langley's observations in the Sierra Nevada was the enormous extension given by them to the solar spectrum in the invisible region below the red. The first to make any detailed acquaintance with these obscure beams was Captain Abney, whose success in obtaining a substance—the so-called 'blue bromide' of silver—sensitive to their chemical action, enabled him to derive photographic impressions from rays possessing the relatively great wave-length of 1,200 millionths of a millimetre. This, be it noted, approaches very closely to the theoretical limit set by Cauchy to that end of the spectrum. The information was accordingly received with no small surprise that the bolometer showed

* S. P. Langley, 'Nature,' vol. xxvi. p. 316.

† Sir J. Herschel's estimate of the 'temperature of space' was 239° F.; Pouillet's 224° F. below zero. Both are almost certainly much too high. See Taylor, 'Bull. Phil. Soc. Washington,' vol. ii. p. 73; and Croll, 'Nature,' vol. xxi. p. 521.

entirely unmistakable heating effects from vibrations of the wave-length 2800. The 'dark continent' of the solar spectrum was thus demonstrated to cover an expanse nearly eight times that of the bright or visible part.* And in this newly discovered region lie three-fifths of the entire energy received from the sun—three-fifths of the vital force imparted to our planet for keeping its atmosphere and ocean in circulation, its streams rippling and running, its forests growing, its grain ripening. Throughout this wide range of vibrations the modifying power of our atmosphere is little felt. It is, indeed, interrupted by great gaps produced by absorption *somewhere*; but since they show no signs of diminution at high altitudes, they are obviously due to an extra-terrestrial cause. Here a tempting field of inquiry lies open to scientific explorers.

On one other point, earlier ideas have had to give way to better-grounded ones derived from this fruitful series of investigations. Professor Langley has effected a redistribution of energy in the solar spectrum. The maximum of heat was placed by former inquirers in the obscure tract of the infra-red; he has promoted it to a position in the orange approximately coincident with the point of greatest luminous intensity. The triple curve, denoting by its three distinct summits the supposed places in the spectrum of the several maxima of heat, light, and 'actinism,' must now finally disappear from our text-books, and with it the last vestige of belief in a corresponding threefold distinction of qualities in the solar radiations. From one end to the other of the whole gamut of them, there is but one kind of difference—that of wave-length, or frequency in vibration; and there is but one curve by which the rays of the spectrum can properly be represented—that of energy, or the power of doing work on material particles. What the effect of that work may be, depends upon the special properties of such material particles, not upon any recondite faculty in the radiations.

These brilliant results of a month's bivouac encourage the most sanguine anticipations as to the harvest of new truths to be gathered by a steady and well-organised pursuance of the same plan of operations. It must, however, be remem-

* This is true only of the 'normal spectrum,' formed by reflection from a 'grating' on the principle of interference. In the spectrum produced by refraction, the red rays are *huddled together* by the distorting effect of the prism through which they are transmitted.

bered that the scheme completed on Mount Whitney had been carefully designed, and in its preliminary parts executed at Alleghany. The interrogatory was already prepared; it only remained to register replies, and deduce conclusions. Nature seldom volunteers information: usually it has to be extracted from her by skilful cross-examination. The main secret of finding her a good witness consists in having a clear idea beforehand what it is one wants to find out. No opportunities of seeing will avail those who know not what to look for. Thus, not the crowd of casual observers, but the few who consistently and systematically *think*, will profit by the efforts now being made to rid the astronomer of a small fraction of his terrestrial impediments. It is, nevertheless, admitted on all hands that no step can at present be taken at all comparable in its abundant promise of increased astronomical knowledge to that of providing suitably elevated sites for the exquisite instruments constructed by modern opticians.

Europe has not remained behind America in this significant movement. An observatory on Mount Etna, at once astronomical, meteorological, and seismological, was nominally completed in the summer of 1882, and will doubtless before long begin to give proof of efficiency in its three-fold capacity. The situation is magnificent. Etna has long been famous for the amplitude of the horizon commanded from it, and the serenity of its encompassing skies favours celestial no less than terrestrial vision. Professor Langley, who made a stay of twenty days upon the mountain in 1879-80, with the object of reducing to strict measurement the advantages promised by it, came to the conclusion that the 'seeing' there is better than that in England (judging from data given by Mr. Webb) in the proportion of three to two—that is to say, a telescope of two inches aperture on Etna would show as much as one of three in England. Yet the circumstances attending his visit were of the least favourable kind. He was unable to find a suitable shelter higher up than Casa del Bosco, an isolated hut within the forest-belt (as its name imports), at considerably less than half the elevation of the new observatory; the imperfect mounting of his telescope rendered observation all but impossible within a range of 30 degrees from the zenith, thus excluding the most serene portion of the sky; moreover, his arrival was delayed until December 25, when the weather was thoroughly broken, high winds were incessantly troublesome, and only five nights out of seventeen proved astro-

nomically available. It is, accordingly, reassuring to learn that while, with the naked eye, at ordinary levels, he could see but six Pleiades, with glimpses of a seventh and eighth, on Etna he steadily distinguished nine even before the moon had set;* and that the telescopic definition, though not uniformly good, was on December 31 such as he had never before seen on the sun, 'least of all with a blue sky;'† the 'rice-grain' structure came out beautifully under a power of 212; and for the spectroscopic examination of prominences, the fainter orange light of their helium constituent served almost equally well with the strong radiance of the crimson ray of hydrogen (C)—a test of transparency which those accustomed to such studies will appreciate.

The Etnean observatory is the most elevated building in Europe. It stands at a height above the sea of 9,655 ft., or 1,483 ft. above the monastery of the Great St. Bernard. Its walls enclose the well-known 'Casa Inglese,' where travellers were accustomed to spend the night before undertaking the final ascent of the cone, and occupy a site believed secure from the incursions of lava. Astronomical work is designed to be carried on there from June to September. For the Merz equatorial, 35 centimetres (13·8 inches) in aperture, which is *facile primus* of its instrumental equipment, a duplicate mounting has been provided at Catania, whither it will be removed during the winter months. The primary aim of the establishment is the study of the sun. Its great desirability for this purpose formed the theme of the representations from Signor Tacchini (then director of the observatory of Palermo, now of that of the Collegio Romano), which determined the Italian Government upon trying the experiment. But we hear with pleasure that stellar spectroscopy will also come in for a large share of attention. The privilege of observation from the summit of Etna will not be enjoyed exclusively by the local staff. The Municipality of Catania, who have borne their share in the expense of the undertaking, generously propose to give it somewhat of an international character, by providing accommodation for any foreign astronomers who may desire to enjoy a respite from the hampering conditions of low-level star-gazing. We cannot doubt that such exceptional facilities will be turned to the best account.

Eight years have now passed since General de Nansonty,

* Am. Jour. of Science, vol. xx. p. 36.

† Ibid. p. 41.

aided by the engineer Vaussenat, established himself for the winter on the top of the Pic du Midi. Zeal for the promotion of weather-knowledge was the impelling motive of this adventure, which included, amongst other rude incidents, a snow-siege of little less than six months. It resulted in crowning one of the highest crests of the Pyrenees with a permanent meteorological observatory, opened for work in 1881. It is now designed to render the station available for astronomical purposes as well.

The important tasks in progress at the Paris observatory have of late been singularly impeded by bad weather. During the latter half of 1882 scarcely four or five 'good nights per month were secured, and in December these were reduced to two.* Moreover, M. Thollon, who, according to his custom, arrived from Nice in June for the summer's work, returned thither in September without having found the opportunity of making *one single* spectroscopic observation. Yet within easy and immediate reach was a post, already in scientific occupation, where, as General de Nansonty reported, ordinary print was legible by the radiance of the milky way and zodiacal light alone, and fifteen or sixteen Pleiades could be counted with the naked eye. At length Admiral Mouchez, the energetic director of the Paris observatory, convinced of the urgent need of an adjunct establishment under less sulky skies, issued to MM. Thollon and Trépied a commission of inquiry into telescopic possibilities on the Pic du Midi. Their stay lasted from August 17 to September 22, 1883, and their experiences were summarised in a note (preliminary to a detailed report) published in the 'Comptes Rendus' for October 15, glowing with a certain technical enthusiasm difficult to be conveyed to those who have never strained their eyes to catch the vanishing gleam of a 'chromospheric line' through a 'milky' sky, and dim and tremulous air. The definition, they declared, was simply marvellous. Not even in Upper Egypt had they seen anything like it. The sun stood out, clean-cut and vivid, on a dark blue sky, and so slight were the traces of diffusion, that, for observations at his edge, the conditions approached those of a total eclipse. These advantages are forcibly illustrated by the statement that, instead of eight lines ordinarily visible in the entire spectrum of the chromosphere, more than thirty revealed them-

* Report of the Paris Observatory, 'Astronomical Register,' Oct. 1883; and 'Observatory,' No. 75.

selves in the orange and green parts of it alone (D to F) ! A fact still more remarkable is that prominences were actually seen, and their forms distinguished, though fore-shortened and faint, on the very disc of the sun itself—and this not merely by such glimmering views as had previously, at especially favourable moments, tantalised the sight of Young and Tacchini, but steadily and with certainty. We are further told that, on the mornings of September 19 and 20, Venus was discerned, without aid from glasses, within two degrees of the sun.

These extraordinary facilities of vision disappeared, indeed, as, with the advance of day, the slopes of the mountain became heated and set the thin air quivering ; but were reproduced at night in the tranquil splendour of moon and stars.

The expediency of using such opportunities was obvious ; and it has accordingly been determined to erect a good equatorial in this tempting situation, elevated 9,375 feet above the troubles of the nether air. The expense incurred will be trifling ; no special staff will be needed ; the post will simply constitute a dependency of the Paris establishment, where astronomers thrown out of work by the malice of the elements may find a refuge from enforced idleness, as well as, possibly, unlooked-for openings to distinction.

We must now ask our readers to accompany us in one more brief flight across the Atlantic. After a successful observation of the late transit of Venus at Jamaica, Dr. Copeland, the chief astronomer of Lord Crawford's observatory at Dun Echt, took advantage of the railway which now crosses the Western Andes at an elevation of 14,666 feet, to make a high-level tour of exploration in the interests of science. Some of the results communicated by him to the British Association at Southport last year, and published, with more detail, in the astronomical journal '*Copernicus*,' are extremely suggestive. At La Paz, in Bolivia, 12,050 feet above the sea, a naked-eye sketch of the immemorially familiar star-groups in Taurus, *made in full moonlight*, showed seventeen Hyades (two more than are given in Argelander's '*Uranometria Nova*') and ten Pleiades. Now ordinary eyes under ordinary circumstances see six, or at most seven, stars in the latter cluster. Hipparchus censured Aratus—who took his facts on trust from Eudoxus—for stating the lesser number, on the ground that in serene weather, and in the absence of the moon, a seventh was discernible.* On the other hand,

several of the ancients reckoned nine Pleiades, and we are assured that Moestlin, the worthy preceptor of Kepler, was able to detect, under the little propitious skies of Wurtemberg, no less than fourteen.* An instance of keensightedness but slightly inferior is afforded by a contemporary American observer: Mr. Henry Carvill Lewis, of Germantown, Pennsylvania, frequently perceives twelve of this interesting sidereal community.† The number of Pleiades counted is, then, without some acquaintance with the observer's ordinary range of sight, a quite indeterminate criterion of atmospheric clearness; although we readily admit that Dr. Copeland's detection of ten in the very front of a full moon gives an exalted idea of visual possibilities at La Paz.

During the season of *tempestades*—from the middle of December to the end of March—the weather in the Andes is simply abominable. Mr. Whympers describes everything as 'bottled up in mist' after one brief bright hour in the early morning, and complains, writing from Quito, March 18, 1880,‡ that his exertions had been left unrewarded by a single view from any one of the giant peaks scaled by him. Dr. Copeland adds a lamentable account—doubly lamentable to an astronomer in search of improved definition—of thunderstorms, torrential rains merging into snow or hail, overcast nocturnal skies, and 'visible exhalations' from the drenched pampas. At Puno, however, towards the end of March, he succeeded in making some valuable observations, notwithstanding the detention—as contraband of war, apparently—of a large part of his apparatus. Puno is the terminal station on the Andes railway, and is situated at an altitude of 12,540 feet.

Here he not only discovered, with a 6-inch achromatic, mounted as need prescribed, several very close stellar pairs, of which Sir John Herschel's 18-inch speculum had given him no intelligence; but in a few nights' 'sweeping' with a very small Vogel's spectroscope, he just doubled the known number of a restricted, but peculiarly interesting, class of stars—if stars indeed they be. For while in the telescope they exhibit the ordinary stellar appearance of lucid points, they disclose, under the compulsion of prismatic analysis, the characteristic marks of a gaseous constitution; that is to say, the principal part of their light is concentrated in a

* Cosmos, vol. iii. p. 272 note.

† Am. Jour. of Science, vol. xx. p. 437.

‡ Nature, vol. xxii. p. 19.

few bright lines. The only valid distinction at present recognisable by us between stars and nebulæ is thus, if not wholly abolished, at least rendered of a purely conventional character. We may agree to limit the term 'nebulæ' to bodies of a certain chemical constitution; but we cannot limit the doings of Nature, or insist on the maintenance of an arbitrary line of demarcation. From the keen rays of Vega to the undefined lustre of the curdling wisps of cosmical fog clinging round the sword hilt of Orion, the distance is indeed enormous. But so it is from a horse to an oak tree; yet when we descend to volvoxes and diatoms, it is impossible to pronounce offhand in which of the two great provinces of the kingdom of life we are treading. It would now seem that the celestial spaces have also their volvoxes and diatoms—'limiting instances,' as Bacon termed such—bodies that share the characters, and hang on the borders of two orders of creation.

In 1867 MM. Wolf and Rayet, of Paris, discovered that three yellow stars in the Swan, of about the eighth magnitude, possessed the notable peculiarity of a bright-line spectrum. It was found by Respighi and Le Sueur to be shared by one of the second order of brightness in Argo (γ Argûs), and Professor Pickering, of Harvard, reinforced the species, in 1880-1, with two further specimens. Dr. Copeland's necessarily discursive operations on the shores of Lake Titicaca raised the number of its members at once from six to eleven or twelve. Now the smaller 'planetary' nebulæ—so named by Sir William Herschel from the planet-like discs presented by the first-known and most conspicuous amongst them—are likewise only distinguishable from minute stars by their spectra. Their light, when analysed with a prism, instead of running out into a parti-coloured line, gathers itself into one or more bright dots. The position on the prismatic scale of those dots, alone serves to mark them off from the Wolf-Rayet family of stars. Hence the obvious inference that both nebulæ and stars (of this type) are bodies similar in character, but dissimilar in constitution—that they agree in the general plan of their structure, but differ in the particular quality of the substances glowing in the vast incandescent atmospheres which display their characteristic bright lines in our almost infinitely remote spectroscopes. Indeed, the fundamental identity of the two species was virtually demonstrated by the 'migrations' (to use a Baconian phrase) of the 'new star' of 1876, which, as its original conflagration died out, passed through

the stages, successively, of a Wolf-Rayet or *nebular star* (if we may be permitted to coin the term), and of a planetary nebula. So that not all the stars in space are suns—at least, not in the sense given to the word by our domestic experience in the solar system.

The investigation of these objects possesses extraordinary interest. As an index to the true nature of the relation undoubtedly subsisting between the lucid orbs and the 'shining fluid' which equally form part of the sidereal system, their hybrid character renders them of peculiar value. Their distribution—so far restricted to the Milky Way and its borders—may perhaps afford a clue to the organisation of, and processes of change in that stupendous collection of worlds. At present, speculation would be premature; what we want are facts—facts regarding the distances of these anomalous objects—whether or not they fall within the range of the methods of measurement at present available; facts regarding their apparent motions; facts regarding the specific differences of the light emitted by them: its analogies with that of other bodies; its possible variations in amount or kind. The accumulation of any sufficient information on these points will demand, with every external aid, the patient labour of years; under average conditions at the earth's surface it can scarcely be considered as practically feasible. The facility of Dr. Copeland's discoveries sufficiently sets off the prerogatives, in this respect, of elevated stations; it is not too much to say that this purpose—were it solely in view—would fully justify the demand for their establishment.

Towards one other subject which we might easily be tempted to dwell upon, we will barely glance. Most of our readers have heard something of Dr. Huggins's new method of photographing the corona. Its importance consists in the prospect which it seems to offer of substituting for scanty and hurried researches during the brief moments of total eclipse, a leisurely and continuous study of that remarkable solar appendage. The method may be described as a *differential* one. It depends for its success on the superior intensity of coronal to ordinary sunlight in the extreme violet region. And since it happens that chloride of silver is sensitive to those rays *only* in which the corona is strongest, the coronal form disengages itself photographically, from the obliterating splendour which effectually shrouds it visually, by the superior vigour of its impression upon a chloride of silver film.

Now if this ingenious mode of procedure is to be rendered of any practical avail, advantage must, above all, be taken of the finer air of the mountains. This for two reasons. First, because the glare which, as it were, smothers the delicate structure we want to obtain records of, is there at a minimum; secondly, because the violet rays by which it impresses itself upon the 'photographic retina'* are there at a maximum. These, as Professor Langley's experiments show, suffer far more from atmospheric ravages than their less refrangible companions in the spectrum; the gain thus to them, relatively to the general gain, grows with every yard of ascent; the proportion, in other words, of short and quick vibrations in the light received becomes exalted as we press upwards—a fact brought into especial prominence by Dr. Copeland's solar observations at Vincocaya, 14,360 feet above the sea-level. Indeed, for all the operations of celestial photography, the advantages of great altitudes can hardly be exaggerated; and celestial photography is gradually assuming an importance which its first tentative efforts, thirty-four years ago, gave little reason to expect.

Thus, in three leading departments of modern astronomy—solar physics, stellar spectroscopy, and the wide field of photography—the aid of mountain observatories may be pronounced indispensable; while in all there is scarcely a doubt that it will prove eminently useful. There are, indeed, difficulties and drawbacks to their maintenance. The choice of a site, in the first place, is a matter requiring the most careful deliberation. Not all elevated points are available for the purpose. Some act persistently as vapour-condensers, and seldom doff their sullen cap of clouds. From any mountain in the United Kingdom, for instance, it would be folly to expect any astronomical benefit. On Ben Nevis, the chief amongst them, a meteorological observatory has recently been established with the best auguries of success; but it would indeed be a sanguine star-gazer who should expect improved telescopic opportunities from its misty summit.

Even in more favoured climates, storms commonly prevail on the heights during several months of the year, and vehement winds give more or less annoyance at all seasons; the direct sunbeams sear the skin like a hot iron; the chill air congeals the blood. Dr. Copeland records that at Vincocaya, one afternoon in June, the black bulb thermometer exposed to solar radiation stood at 199°·1 of Fahrenheit—

* An expression used by Mr. Warren de la Rue.

actually 13° above the boiling-point of water in that lofty spot—while the dry bulb was coated with ice! Still more formidable than these external discomforts is the effect on the human frame itself of transportation into a considerably rarer medium than that for existence in which it was constituted. The head aches; the pulse throbs; every inspiration is a gasp for breath; exertion becomes intolerable. Mr. Whymper's example seems to show that these extreme symptoms disappear with the resolute endurance of them, and that the system gradually becomes inured to its altered circumstances. But the probationary course is a severe one; and even though life flow back to its accustomed channels, labour must always be painfully impeded by a diminution of the vital supply. Add the minor but very sensible inconveniences caused by the difficulty of cooking with water that boils twenty or thirty degrees (according to the height) below 212° , by the reluctance of fires to burn, and of tobacco to keep alight, and we complete a sufficiently deterrent list of the penalties attendant on literal compliance with the magnanimous motto, *Altiora petimus*.

That they will, nevertheless, not prove deterrent we may safely predict. Enthusiasm for science will assuredly overbear all difficulties that are not impossibilities. Dr. Copeland, taking all into account, ventures to recommend the occupation during the most favourable season—say from October to December—of an 'extra-elevated station' 18,500 ft. above the sea, more than one promising site for which might be found in the vicinity of Lake Titicaca. For a permanent mountain observatory, however, he believes that 12,500 ft. would be the outside limit of practical usefulness. It is probable, indeed, that the Rocky Mountains will anticipate the Andes in lending the aid of their broad shoulders to lift astronomers towards the stars. Already a meteorological post has been established on Pike's Peak in Colorado, at an altitude of 14,151 ft. Telescopic vision there is said to be of rare excellence; we shall be surprised if its benefits be not ere long rendered available.

After all, the present strait of optical astronomy is but the inevitable consequence of its astonishing progress. While instruments remained feeble and imperfect, atmospheric troubles were comparatively little felt; they became intolerable when all other obstacles to a vast increase in the range of distinct vision were removed. The arrival of that stage in the history of the telescope, when the advantages to be derived from its further development should be

completely neutralised by the more and more sensibly felt disadvantages of our situation on an air-encompassed globe, was only a question of time. The point was a fixed one: it could be reached later only by a more sluggish advance. Both the difficulty and its remedy were foreseen 167 years ago by the greatest of astronomers and opticians.

‘If the theory of making telescopes,’ Sir Isaac Newton wrote in 1717,* ‘could at length be fully brought into practice, yet there would be certain bounds beyond which telescopes could not perform. For the air through which we look upon the stars is in a perpetual tremor, as may be seen by the tremulous motion of shadows cast from high towers, and by the twinkling of the fixed stars. The only remedy is a most serene and quiet air, such as may perhaps be found on the tops of the highest mountains above the grosser clouds.’

ART. III.—1. *Quickborn: Volksleben in plattdeutschen Gedichten ditmarscher Mundart.* Von KLAUS GROTH. Berlin: 1873.

2. *Briefe über Hochdeutsch und Plattdeutsch.* Von Dr. KLAUS GROTH. Kiel: 1858.

A BOOK of poems published in Germany upwards of thirty years ago, which has passed through a number of editions, both plain and illustrated, rarely escapes the notice of English readers. Yet we venture to predict that the name of ‘Quickborn’ and of its author will be heard for the first time by many of our readers. The reason of this anomaly is not far to seek. The Low-German dialect in which those poems are written is one with which few English readers are likely to be familiar; and so closely is the charm of the poetry connected with the homeliness of the dialect, that every translation has failed to catch it.

Away in the extreme north-west corner of the German Empire, between the estuaries of the Elbe and the Eider, lies a small tract of country called the Ditmarsch. It is inhabited by a people who have been remarkable from the earliest times for their courage and love of freedom. Up to the year 1559 they maintained their independence and defied all the surrounding powers. It was only after a struggle, which lasted for centuries, that they succumbed to the yoke of Denmark. The whole of the Ditmarsch is more or less flat,

* Optice, p. 107 (2nd ed. 1719. Author’s ‘Monitio’ dated July 16, 1717).

but it comprises two distinct divisions which differ widely in this respect. The eastern division, known as the 'Geest,' might be called the Highlands of the Ditmarsch; although such a term can be used only relatively. Its hills are low and scantily wooded, and the greater part of it is covered with large tracts of barren heath, abounding in the so-called *Daepels*, or underground streams, which appear on the surface and run along for a few yards, only to disappear again as mysteriously as they issued. Far richer is the 'Marsch,' or western division, which lies along the sea-coast. It is from the dairies of the 'Marsch' that a great deal of the renowned Kiel butter finds its way to our English breakfast-tables. The whole country here is perfectly flat. Not a single eminence is to be seen as far as the eye can reach, except those two mounds away on the east, which were thrown up as refuge for the people when the sea broke in on the land, and that long monotonous line on the western horizon, which marks the dyke built to prevent the recurrence of a like catastrophe. A network of ditches, wide and narrow, divides the whole country into farms, and the farms into fields. The farmhouses of the Ditmarsch are of a type quite peculiar to the place. So low are the walls, and so far do the huge thatched roofs slouch over them, that it is only after a close examination that we can convince ourselves that there any walls at all.

It was in one of those quaint cottages, in the village of Heide, just on the margin of Marsch and Geest, that Hartwig Groth, the poet's father, lived, and Klaus himself was born. A happier household than the Groths' could hardly have been found in all the Ditmarsch. Here there lived Hartwig with his wife and family of four sons and a daughter, while the group was completed by the grandfather (*de Obbe*), a most interesting character. Klaus was his favourite grandchild, always on his knee in the evening, or trotting along beside him in the fields and eagerly drinking in all his stories of the old heroes who had bled for the freedom of the Ditmarsch. Hartwig Groth was not rich. He had often to keep his son away from school to help with the farm work; but he was an industrious, well-to-do man, and had always succeeded in the struggle against poverty, so that his family were spared from its souring, blighting influence. A happy childhood is often the making of a happy life. It forms a healthy disposition which enables us to fight life's battles cheerily, and lays up a store of sunshine that will light us on the darker days. To this cottage home, with its inmates

and surroundings, the poet constantly reverts with pleasure ; and the result of his travels in after life is only to bring him back to it more fully persuaded that no spot on earth can compare with it.

‘ The little field before our door,
How sweet a spot that was !
Down there at early dawn I ran
Above my knees in grass.

I played there till the evening came
Amongst the stones and sand ;
Then grandfather would fetch me in,
So kindly, hand in hand.

I often wished I were grown up
The great wide world to see :
The old man shook his head and sighed,—
‘ ’Tis time enough,’ said he.

Ah, so it was ! This great wide world
I’ve wandered o’er and o’er.
Oh ! would it were but half so sweet
As yon one at our door !’

In his sixteenth year Klaus left his father’s house to become secretary to a neighbouring country magistrate. He had not been long in this situation when his ardent love of study inspired him with the desire of educating himself for a teacher. With this purpose, he entered the seminary in Tondern, where he passed the examinations with brilliant success, and was appointed schoolmaster in Heide, his native village. Here, under the old roof, and with all the old surroundings, began a long period of happy tranquillity. During this time, in his strolls about the neighbourhood, his visits to his uncles at Tillingstedt, and his intercourse with the neighbours at Heide, he acquired that keen insight into the Ditmarsch peasant’s life which so strongly marks his writings. He has given us a peep of his life at this period :—

‘ Often when I was working in the evening I heard my brother John outside singing with his sweet voice some of our folk-songs. . . . He was always merry, and scarcely a day did we sit down to our mid-day meal—four grown-up brothers and a sister, besides the old people, round the table—but a host of droll remarks or lively stories converted our meal into a perfect feast. Never since have I heard expressed such clear, healthy opinions about people, or such a deep insight into their doings and sayings, as on those occasions.’

It is this brother John, his favourite playmate, that inspires one of the most beautiful of his poems:—

‘I would they’d come again, John,
Those days when we were young.
By neighbour’s well, ah, then! John,
We sat whole evenings long.
The silent moon we watched o’erhead
From out the white clouds peep,
And talked of how the heavens were high,
And how the well was deep.

Just think how still that was, John,—
The world all hushed to rest—
’Tis thus no more, alas! John,
Or just in dreams at best.
And when some distant shepherd’s song
Trilled o’er the moorland lone,
Oh! John, ’twas music that indeed,—
Was sweeter ever known?

Sometimes at eventide, John,
I feel my heart still swell,
As when once side by side, John,
We sat by neighbour’s well.
Then eagerly I turn me round,
As though you still were by;
Ah! John, the only thing I find
Is—that I stand and cry!’

Such a life, unbroken by any event of greater importance than a trip in Germany, Klaus Groth continued to live till his twenty-eighth year. But if his life was uneventful, it was far from idle. He was one of those who ‘scorn delights, and live laborious days.’ The early morning always found him at his studies, and he had recourse to an ingenious expedient for ensuring his being wakened betimes. Every night when he went to bed he fastened a string round his wrist, and hung the other end of it out at the window. The purpose of Klaus’s string was quite understood by all the villagers, and the first who happened to be astir never forgot to tug it, and to keep on tugging it till the schoolmaster himself appeared at the window to thank him for his kind service and testify to its success. Poetry had a special charm for him, and, as he was gifted with a strong natural talent for languages, it was not long before he was quite familiar with the beauties of German, English, and Swedish literature. But his special predilection for poetry did not prevent him

from devoting some of his time to the sciences, especially to botany, of which he acquired an extensive knowledge.

The strain of those studious habits, coupled with the hard work of teaching, soon began to tell on his health. A complete change of life became imperative, and he resolved to abandon his scholastic career and devote himself entirely to poetry. With this purpose he withdrew himself to the little island of Femarn. There, almost within hearing of the cannons which were to decide once more the destiny of his native land, his book of poems was written, and published, in 1852, under the title of 'Quickborn,' which means 'Living Fountain.'

Beyond this point we need not trace the poet's life. When he left Heide he had already laid up all the store of happy observations from which the materials of his poems are drawn. It is of the days he spent in Heide that he sings in his sweetest strains, of the songs his mother lulled him to sleep with, of the weird tales his grandfather used to tell. It is the characters he met there that live and breathe in his Idylls. It is the tidy little farms of the 'Marsch,' or the bare heaths of the 'Geest,' that form the harmonious background of the whole. His heart was overflowing, and he felt he had but to look in it and write.

But there was something more in Klaus Groth's mission. Not only was he to write the songs of his native land, but to write them in his native dialect—the Low-German of the Ditmarsch. 'We write,' he tells us, 'to redeem the honour of the Low-German language.' The language in which an author writes bears the same intimate relation to his writings as the material of which a building is constructed does to its architectural design. A marble palace would look ridiculous if reproduced in brick; nor can the ornamentation which is easy in freestone be carried out in granite. It will, therefore, not be amiss to give some account of this Low-German dialect which supplies the raw material of Klaus Groth's poems.

We must not imagine that Low-German implies anything low or vulgar. It owes its name to the fact of its being the language spoken by the inhabitants of the low-lying, flat countries of Northern Europe, in distinction to High-German, the language spoken in the inland and more mountainous districts. Low-German is not a *patois*, or corruption of High-German. The two languages stand to each other in the relation of sisters, not of mother and daughter. Both have descended from a common source, and both of them

comprise a group of dialects of their own. Among the dialects of the Low-German are Dutch, Flemish, and this Ditmarsch dialect which we are considering; and so great is the resemblance between the last two members of this group, that on the appearance of 'Quickborn,' the Flemish hailed it with delight as written in their 'dear mother tongue' (*deerbare Moderspraak*). The High-German also comprised a group of dialects; but one member of that group has grown so great and powerful that it has either absorbed or overshadowed its weaker neighbours. This dialect is what is now familiar to us all as 'German.' Notwithstanding that High-German has grown bigger and stronger than her sister, there is every reason to believe that Low-German is the older of the two—less altered, that is, from the original language, the mother of both, the language of heroic times, and therefore emphatically the language of poetry. But there is still another circumstance which renders the Ditmarsch dialect specially fitted for poetry, and that is its virginity. It is the natural, undistorted language of the people who speak it. It has never been tamed and harnessed into literature, never expurgated by an Academy of philosophers, or measured off and confined within the precincts of an authorised dictionary. There are no words exclusively confined to poetic use, no special vocabulary of pathos or of strength. Each word has its full primitive force. Klaus Groth had to learn this language as Luther learned German, not from books, but 'from the mother in the house, the children in the lanes, the men at the market; from talking to them and watching their mouths' (*denselben auf das Maul sehen*). The increased scope which such a language affords, especially to an idyllic poet, may readily be conceived. Theocritus wrote his Idylls not in the stately Attic Greek, but in the homely dialect of Bœotia. The Ditmarsch dialect is the natural element of Klaus Groth's poems. They grow and flourish in it as water-lilies do in water, and the translator who separates them from it must be prepared to see their beauty parch up and die.

The poet's love for this language was quite as great as for the people that spoke it. To prove that it was a really 'living fountain,' and could be used as a vehicle of poetry, was the ambition of his life. Long after 'Quickborn' had achieved its success, he wrote of it: 'I am wont to regard this book, not as something I have given, but something I have received. The only merit I lay claim to is having recognised the capabilities of our language; and I would

‘refer every one not to the book, but to the “living fountain” from which it has been created.’ The latent capabilities of the Ditmarsch dialect we fully admit—‘Quickborn’ itself bears evidence to them. But that Low-German can ever hold her own against her High-German sister, as his ‘Letters on Low- and High-German’ attempt to show, we can only regard as a poet’s dream. There is something pathetic in the passion and the ingenuity which he spends in this hopeless task. The spirit of progress will not listen to the appeals or even to the arguments of a poet. She obeys no law but the survival of the fittest; and all that is unfit, however beautiful, melts away before her breath. The railway and the telegraph are rapidly doing their work. The Gaelic in Scotland, the Welsh in Wales, the Breton in France, are fast dying out. The superstitions, the characters, the very costumes that accompanied them are all but vanished. And what is happening there will happen in the Ditmarsch too. The German empire has already devoured her independence: ere long her language will follow it.

When our poet first turned his attention to his native tongue, he found it clogged with the rust and dust of centuries. Not only must it be freed from these, but the workman must learn to handle his tools. Accordingly we find him setting himself diligently to practise the translation of German poetry into the Ditmarsch dialect. The German forms, however, were too familiar and too persistent to be shaken off in this way; and it became necessary to seek his models in some less kindred tongue. Those models he ultimately found in the poems of Robert Burns. By translating a number of those—notably ‘Tam o’ Shanter’—he soon acquired the needful facility in handling Low-German.

It was not unlikely that Klaus Groth should have his sympathy awakened by a certain similarity between Burns’s circumstances and his own. Burns, like himself, was a man sprung from the people, and one whose highest ambition was to be the poet of his people:—

‘That I for poor auld Scotland’s sake
Some useful plan or book could make,
Or sing a sang at least.’

Burns, too, had written in the dialect of his fellow peasants, and had succeeded in painting humble peasant life with a poetry and pathos never before attained. And yet the two poets have little in common. They differ as widely as the two countries they dwelt in; as the ‘land of the mountain and the flood’ differs from the low, flat Dit-

marsch. The Scotchman's wit, as well as his strength, is wanting in the Ditmarsch poet; but in pathos they are equally met; while the latter even surpasses in the portrayal of peasant life, and the depiction of peasant character. 'Tam o' Shanter' and 'The Address to the De'il,' with their marvellous alloy of sublimity, humour, and pathos, would be far beyond the powers of Klaus Groth. We might say they would be beyond the powers of any one except Burns himself. But the 'Cotter's Saturday Night' is quite within his reach.

The widest point of separation between the two poets is the difference in what Matthew Arnold would call their 'criticism of life.' Burns, throughout his whole career, had been condemned to fight with poverty, and was, or thought he was, the victim of oppression and neglect. His ambitions had ever been frustrated, and he was driven to regard life through a medium of disappointment and discontent. Klaus Groth, on the other hand, had never known what grief and disappointment were. Contentment is the key-note to all his poems. It is thus he expresses his view of life by the mouth of one of his characters:—

'And has the world grown sadder than of old?
Let him but take a closer, surer look;
And, if within himself be found a heart,
Then he will see the world is still as true,
As happy, and as homely, and as gay
As all the fairest tales that e'er were told.'

The trait which specially strikes us in Klaus Groth is precisely what the ablest of Burns's critics deplores his not having possessed—'a true religious principle of morals.' In everything, Klaus Groth is religious. The contemplation of nature 'disturbs him with the joy of elevated thoughts.' The quiet summer evening awakens thoughts of the peace of Heaven and invites him to prayer.

'The world around is sleeping,
Deep sunk in dreams it lies;
No sound of mirth or weeping
Disturbs the silent skies.'
.
.
.
All care and strife allaying,
Heaven sheds her peace abroad:
It is a time for praying,
Oh, hear me, gracious God!'

But he is not given to moralising. His poems are highly moral, but they carry their moral in them: they have none attached.

It is in the form of some of his songs that Burns's influence has really made itself felt in Klaus Groth's poetry. Our readers may have noticed some traces of this in a poem already cited; but in 'Min Anna' he cannot fail to be struck with it. We give the original of this song, as well as a translation:—

'Min Anna is en Ros' so roth,
Min Anna is min Blom,
Min Anna is en Swölk to Fot,
Min Anna is as melk un Blot,
As Appel oppen Bom.

De Vullmach hett en Appelgarn,
Un Rosen inne Strat;
De Vullmach kann sin Rosen wahn,
De Vullmach kann sin Appeln arn:
Min Anna is min Stat!

Se is min Stat, se is min Freid,
Un Allens alltomal;
Un wenn de Wind de Rosen weiht,
Un wenn de Wind de Appeln flet:
Se fallt mi nich hendal.

Se fallt ni af, se fallt ni hin,
Se hett son frischen Moth;
So blöht min Hart, so blöht min
Sinn,
Min Anna blüet de Blom derin
Bet an min seli Dod.

My Annie's like the rose so red,
My own sweet flower is she;
As swallows' light, my Annie's tread,
My Annie's cheek's with crimson shed,
Like apple on the tree.

The Squire has fields of apples full,
And beds of roses blown;
And let the Squire his apples pull,
And let the Squire his roses cull,
My Annie's still my own!

She is my own, she is my all,
And more than all to me.
And when at windy winter's call
The roses fade, and apples fall,
Nor fade nor fall will she.

Ah, no! she'll never faded grow,
She's always bright and gay;
But while life through my heart shall
flow,
My Annie still its flower shall blow,
Yes, till my dying day.

The greater part of 'Quickborn' is occupied by short lyric poems and songs. We shall single out a few by way of illustration. They are not necessarily the finest, but they are representative.

The decay of nature in autumn has afforded a theme to so many poets, that their treatment of it might be used as a standard of comparison of their different manners as well as their different merits. Here is how Klaus Groth treats this subject:—

'The summer now is waning fast;
Her farewell greeting, see;
Of all the flowers I've culled the last,
A posy, Love, for thee.

And when the first ones bloom anew,
If bloom they ever will,
God only grant they find us two
Beside each other still!

Then, though the seasons fail to bring
The flowers they brought before,
Sweet Hope will paint all gay, and Spring
Will bloom for us once more.'

Very characteristic too is the little poem 'As ik wegging.' It is invested with a peculiar interest, as having been the favourite of Heine, and translated into French prose by his friend Reinhardt, under Heine's own supervision :—

'Du brochst mi bet den Barg tohöch
De Sünn de sack hendal :
Do säst du sachen, dat war Tid,
Un wunst di mit enmal.

Do stunn ik dar un seeg opt Holt,
Grön inne Abendsünn,
Deen seeg ik langs den smallen Weg,
Dar gingst du ruhi hin.

Do weerst du weg, doch weer de Thorn
Noch smuck un blank to sehn ;
Ik gung de anner Sid hendal :
Dar weer ik ganz alleen.

Nös heff ik öfter Assched nam'—
Got wett wa mennimal !
Min hart dat is dar baben blebn
Süht vun den Barg hendal.'

The simple rusticity of this poem would be quite incongruous with the conventionality of French verse, and Reinhardt has done well in avoiding it.

'Tu me conduisis jusqu'en haut sur la montagne ; le soleil s'abaissait vers l'horizon ; alors tu dis à voix basse, qu'il se faisait tard déjà, et tu te retournas soudain.

'Je restai là, immobile, et je regardai d'en haut la forêt qui verdoyait au soleil du soir ; puis je regardai le long du chemin étroit, où tu t'en allais tranquillement.

'Et puis tu disparus ; mais je voyais encore la belle et blanche tour de l'église. Je descendis de l'autre côté de la montagne, et alors je fus tout à fait seul.

'Plus tard, j'ai souvent encore pris congé de toi en esprit—Dieu sait combien de fois ! Mon cœur est resté là-haut sur la montagne, et il regarde en bas dans la vallée.'

One more example, and we shall take leave of this part of 'Quickborn.' It is one of his *dünjens*, or little songs (*cantilenæ*).

'No ditch is so deep, nor so high any wall,
If two love each other, they'll meet spite of all.

No storm is so blinding, no night is so black,
If two lovers tryste, they will still find the track.

If the moon doesn't shine, there's a star in the sky,
Or a lantern at least, or a torch handy by.

O'er the ditch there's a bridge, there's a gap in the wall,
If two love each other, they'll meet spite of all.'

To some of our readers this glimpse of Klaus Groth's Low-German lyrics may recall the Low-English poems—as we might aptly describe them—which Mr. Barnes has written in the Dorset dialect; * and a closer study of both poets will confirm this impression. Mr. Barnes has bestowed much study on the philology and history of the dialect in which he writes, and his researches greatly increase our interest in Klaus Groth's country, for they point to the conclusion that it was from this very part of Europe that the ancestors of our West-of-England countrymen originally came. 'The 'rustic dialect of Dorsetshire,' Mr. Barnes believes, 'has 'come down by independent descent from the Saxon dialect 'which our forefathers, the followers of the Saxon leaders, 'Cerdic and Cynric, Porta, Stuf, and Wihtgar, brought from 'the South of Denmark, their island seat, which King Alfred 'calls "Eald Seaxan" or Old Saxony, in what is now Holstein, and from the three islands, Nordstrand, Busen, and 'Heligoland.' There exists, therefore, a nearer kindred than the mere touch of nature between the Dorset peasantry and the peasantry of the Ditmarsch; and we may well be prepared to find a likeness between the poems which interpret the life and sentiments of each. Such a likeness bears the surest testimony to the truth of both their poets. We find the harvest-homes and Christmas festivals as merry amongst the descendants of Cerdic and Cynric in Dorsetshire as amongst the descendants of those they left behind them centuries ago, in their distant home across the seas. They laugh over the same pleasures; they weep over the same griefs. Even in their rustic superstitions they are the same. That dreaded 'weepen leädy' whose ghost may be seen in the vale of Blackmore,

'When läate o' nights, above the green
By thik wold house, the moon do sheen,'

reminds us of the kindred ghost who haunts 'dat gruli hus' away in the Ditmarsch. In his memories of childhood Mr.

* 'Poems of Rural Life in the Dorset Dialect,' by William Barnes. London: 1883. But the first edition of these charming poems was published thirty years ago.

Barnes is at his best, and it is there too that he most closely resembles Klaus Groth:

'How mother, when we used to stun
Her head wi' all our naïsy fun,
Did wish us all a-gone vrom hwome;
An' now that zome be dead, an' zome
A-gone, and all the pleâce is dum',
How she do wish, wi' useless tears,
To have ageän about her ears
The vaïces that be gone.'

Verses like these—and Mr. Barnes's rural poems are full of them—owe their charm to the same secret as Klaus Groth's: they come directly from the heart, and they go as directly to it.

Whatever may be the merit of the lyrics and songs, it is in his longer poems—the 'Family Scenes' and Idylls—that Klaus Groth is really at his best. There he has full scope for displaying his skill in the depiction of scenery and character; and it is this skill which constitutes his special excellence.

The 'Family Scenes' consist of a series of detached episodes in the every-day life of a peasant family. The characters that enact them are unmistakably himself and the members of his own household, disguised by nothing but their names. We may, perhaps, be able to give our readers a general idea of the character of those 'Family Scenes' by giving an outline of the finest of the series, the one entitled 'Sunday Morning.' Such a description cannot, of course, convey any of the beauty of the original. It is impossible to describe the perfume of a violet. But it will allow an intelligent reader to form some conception of the plan of the poem, and of the *kind* of beauty which abounds in it.

The scene opens with the mother dusting at the cottage door early on the Sunday morning, while a neighbour's wife stands by talking to her. Her little son is, naturally enough, the subject of conversation, and the mother softly pushes the door ajar so that her neighbour gets a peep into the clean, comfortable room. There, seated by the fire with a book open on his knee, is the old grandfather; while his little grandson leans over the side of his arm-chair looking on to the book and trying his best to follow. In depicting this group the poet uses his wonderful descriptive powers with great skill. It is a marvel of 'word-painting' in the most literal sense. Presently voices and footsteps are heard: it is Christian himself, the good man of the house, returning from his morning stroll round the farm. He has met

with his brother-in-law, 'Uncle Hans,' and brought him back with him. The old grandfather welcomes both; the book is laid aside, and the simmering coffee is taken off the fire and poured into the blue cups that have been standing on the table all ready. Sitting over their coffee, they begin to talk about America, and both father and uncle vie with each other in relating the glowing tales they have heard of this wonderful country, where rich crops grow up without tilling the ground, and cattle run wild, so that one can have them for the catching. Then they contrast with all this the oppression, the competition, and the hard times at home, until Christian exclaims, that if his old father will only consent to the change, he is ready to emigrate to this new land. The grandfather, who has up to this point remained a silent listener, now joins in with an indignant protest. No, they may go if they choose; but he will never come. One cannot change his home as one would change his coat. He could not live without a Fatherland, and those who went there had none.

'Our sires of old have bled in Freedom's cause;
This land is still all teeming with their blood.
There flows a drop of it in every vein,
Be it howe'er so humble, or so high.
This is true Freedom, this that dwells within,
That's born and bred in us from sire to son.
This makes the meanest of us frank and proud,
And makes the best so good, and brave, and true.
All else is idle talk. When Slavery comes,
She comes not from above, but from below.
Powerless are tyrants, if their slaves be brave.'

No, they might go, but he would not. An old tree-stump will not transplant. All his dearest memories circle round the little cottage they are sitting in. He tells them how he bought it years ago; and how he brought his wife to see it just after they were betrothed; and how they both lived in it so happily till she died.

'Twas here I watched her lying cold and still—
Followed her coffin down that very path.
I've carried seven children to their graves.
It seems as though I saw their coffins now,
All borne together in one long sad train,
Some little and some big. Christian alone is left.
He's just as old as yon big ash-tree. Yes,
I planted it the day that he was born.
The smaller one is younger; so's the poplar.
The oak is for my eldest: he died soon.

The chestnut-tree I found here when I came,
 But brought the oak with me from Norderwald.
 How they've all grown ! They seem for ever young ;
 But man must come and go like grass and flowers.'

Touched by the old man's words, his little grandson steals to his side and clasps his arm. Christian rises, lays his one hand on his little son's head, and clasps his father's hand with the other.

'And there they stood like a three-bladed clover—
 The very same in figure, form, and face ;
 And yet as different as the Spring from Autumn—
 The long white winter separating both.'

Just then the church bells ring out through the quiet morning air, and the old man rises up and leads the way to church, to pray that they may never have to leave their dear old home.

In depicting those humble scenes, Klaus Groth reminds us of the Dutch painters. He has all their realism and all their love of colour and expression. But, unlike those painters, he never revels in what is vulgar merely because it is vulgar. There is not a touch of cynicism in any line he ever wrote. And yet he is as alive to the humorous side of low life as Brower or Jan Steen himself. One of his poems tells the story of the adventures of three cobblers, who set out on a fishing expedition, and catch nothing but a frog, a drowned cat, and a good drenching, but are so frightened to come home to their wives with nothing better to show for their day's outing, that they invest in a basket of fish on their way back. This piece is highly humorous. He laughs unsparingly at the unlucky cobblers, but it is a good-natured, hearty laugh, and not the cynical sneer of Jan Steen.

Of the Idylls, 'From the Marsch' (*Ut de Marsch*) is considered by the poet himself to be the best. The story is told in three cantos, and is extremely simple. The heroine is the daughter of the *Vullmach*. There is a *Vullmach* in many of Klaus Groth's stories : he is the chief magistrate of the village, and is looked on by the villagers as being almost as great a man as the king himself. The *Vullmach's* daughter and young Reimer, the schoolmaster's son, fall in love. Reimer is secretary to the *Vullmach*, who, like Balzac's 'Père Grandet,' is a village Rothschild. He has speculations all over the country-side, and everything that he touches prospers. Reimer is kept working day and night, looking after his employer's affairs, and works cheerfully for his sweetheart's sake. But her father is ambitious, and, though

he adores his daughter, he will not hear of her wedding one so far beneath her as Reimer, the schoolmaster's son. She dies of grief, and leaves them both broken-hearted.

We have said that 'From the Marsch' was considered by the poet himself the best of his Idylls. Poets, however, are seldom the best judges of their works; and we think that most would give the palm to 'Peter Kunrad.' Peter, a simple-minded peasant, falls in love with a little actress girl, who has come to the village with a company of travelling actors. To the great grief of his mother, and the scandal of the neighbourhood, he resolves to marry her. The girl turns out quite worthy of the good fellow's love; but nothing will overcome the prejudice of the neighbours, who refuse to have any intercourse with one they consider so low and scandalous a character as an actress. So much do their coldness and insults prey upon the poor girl, that her parents come and steal her away; and honest Peter Kunrad sinks under the weight of grief and shame. The character of Peter Kunrad is drawn with only a few strokes, but it is drawn to the life. We know him as if we had seen him and spoken to him, as if we had laughed at him when he first saw the play, and, like Fielding's Mr. Partridge, took the whole thing for a reality, and attempted to rescue the heroine, to the consternation of both actors and audience; and this laughter 'forms the channel for a tear' when his misfortune overtakes him. 'Peter Kunrad' is quite entitled to be placed alongside of Goethe's 'Hermann and Dorothea.' Indeed the homely dialect in which it is written supplies a charm which is wanting in Goethe's poem, and the value of which we have already discussed.

It is needless to give a further account of those Idylls. To epitomise the story of any of them in a few words would be easy; but to do so gives no idea of their charm; it rather leads us to wonder where their charm can be. There is a subtle sort of beauty which escapes analysis. We often find something beautiful lurking in a simple homely scene—a common brick wall, perhaps, and a clump of trees—and yet we are quite at a loss to account for what that something is.

When 'Quickborn' was published, the merits of its author were speedily recognised in Germany and Denmark. The admiration in which Heine held his poems has already been referred to. Gervinus, who was the first to notice him, has described his works as 'an oasis in the desert of the present.' W. von Humboldt, after poring over 'Quickborn' into the

small hours of the morning, wrote to its author in terms of high praise, and showed his friendship for him in the most substantial way. The University of Bonn hastened to confer on him the honorary degree of Doctor, and he was afterwards appointed to the Chair of Literature in the University of Kiel.

'Quickborn' has been translated into Italian by Professor Teza, of Siena, and parts of it into French by Reinhardt. In England little has been done except by Professor Max Müller, who has noticed it in an article on 'Holstein and the 'Holsteiners,' now forming a chapter in his 'Chips from a 'German Workshop.' The same able scholar, we believe, tried to produce a complete translation of 'Quickborn' in English, with the co-operation of others; but the difficulty of adequately rendering the poems into our language was so great that the scheme had to be abandoned.

It is to the original, therefore, and not to any translation, that English readers must refer; and it is vastly better that it should be so. The strangeness of the dialect may at first present some difficulty; but with the help of Professor Müllenhoff's glossary, appended to the earlier editions of 'Quickborn,' or of the German translation accompanying the edition which heads this article, this difficulty may easily be overcome. To enjoy 'Quickborn,' a thorough knowledge of Low-German is not required. Like John Inglesant with his Plato, we shall soon attain 'that lazy facility which always 'gives a meaning, though often an incorrect one; not always 'a matter of regret to an imaginative reader, as adding a 'charm and, when his own thought is happy, a beauty.'

ART. IV.—*Memoirs of an Ex-Minister.* An Autobiography, by the Right Hon. the Earl of MALMESBURY, G.C.B. 2 vols., 8vo. London: 1884.

ENGLISH literature is not rich in political memoirs. We can hardly recall an instance, since the times of Lord Clarendon and Bishop Burnet, in which an English statesman, having filled offices of the first rank, has left behind him an autobiographical record of the events in which he played a part. It might be added, by way of contrast, that there is scarcely a French statesman or soldier of eminence who has not left some such record for the benefit of posterity; and the history of France for hundreds of years, from St. Louis and Philippe le Bel to the present time, may be read in the incomparable series of memoirs which are one of the most valuable possessions of the French language. Those who are curious in national characteristics might draw some inference from the fact; but we content ourselves with acknowledging that the French memoir-writers are far more numerous and brilliant than our own. We are, therefore, the more grateful to a veteran statesman, like Lord Malmesbury, who consents to make his personal reminiscences and diaries the property of the public, and to retrace the incidents of a long and busy life, with entire truth and simplicity, in the language in which he recorded them at the time. Lord Malmesbury says, modestly enough, that the readers of these *Memoirs* are not to expect a continuous narrative, but rather a *macédoine* of memoranda, diary, and correspondence, recalling the social and political events of a life of seventy-seven years. As he wrote at the time of men, events, and common things, so he publishes his remarks, which have therefore the freshness and reality of a contemporaneous impression, for the most part brief, but essentially clear and true.

And what a vista of incident and change does a retrospect of seventy years open to the view! Every reader of these volumes must be astonished at the prodigious number of events they revive in the memory, and at the velocity with which these events have succeeded each other and passed away. Hardly in any age has the world lived so fast and seen so much, and undergone such vicissitudes. The conditions of time and space have been altered. Almost every action of our daily lives would have been impracticable seventy years ago. The forms, and even the substance, of

social and political life are changed—*et nos mutamur in illis*. The more important is it to trace, even in slight and fugitive lines, the process of this amazing transmutation, in which the younger generation rising about us finds it hard to believe.

But Lord Malmesbury's recollections have a higher character and purport than the record of common things. He has been through life a consistent member of the Tory Party. He became, upon the termination of Sir Robert Peel's Administration, and the rupture of the Conservative body, one of the leaders of the Protectionist section of it, the trusted and valued colleague of its chief. He held the office of Foreign Secretary in the Cabinets of Lord Derby in 1852 and 1858, and the Privy Seal in that of 1866. He supplies, therefore, an important element hitherto entirely wanting to the historian of these times, for he lets us into the councils of the Tory leaders themselves; he produces with very little reserve their correspondence with himself, which was at the time confidential, and is now historical. Our own knowledge of these transactions is naturally derived from the opposite sources of information, which have been more freely published to the world by other hands. Nothing is more curious than to compare the impression produced by a given event or act of policy on the minds of those who were antagonists, and viewed the opposite side of the shield.

In his youth Lord Malmesbury lived a good deal with the Whigs. His father-in-law, Lord Tankerville, had been a Whig. He visited the family of Lord Grey at Howick, and it was at Bowood that he first met Mr. Stanley, the future Lord Derby, then wearing, like his host, Lord Lansdowne, the blue coat and yellow waistcoat which were the appropriate dress of the friends and followers of Mr. Fox. Later in life this acquaintance ripened into the closest intimacy, and the record of Lord Malmesbury's political relations with Lord Derby is the chief object and the most important result of this publication. It supplies us, for the first time, with authentic materials for the biography of that remarkable man, especially during his short Administrations of 1852 and 1858, to which we shall presently have occasion to revert. Lord Derby's numerous letters are of the utmost interest and value, and they do honour to his industry, foresight, and patriotism. It is a pleasing characteristic of English political life, or at least of what has been English political life, that its asperities are tempered by almost un-

broken personal and social relations. Lord Malmesbury has been all his life a strong Tory, but Lord Sydenham, Lord Canning, and Sidney Herbert were his most intimate friends; Lord Lansdowne writes him an affectionate letter on his leaving office; Lord Palmerston and Lord Clarendon assist him with their counsels, and the battle of the night before on the opposing benches of Parliament is forgotten the next day at the dinner-table. Now and then a little explosion of temper takes place, but it is laughed away, and inflicts no lasting wound on the friendships of a life.

It was Lord Malmesbury's good fortune to contract in his earlier years another intimacy which had a considerable influence on his after-life. In the course of a Continental tour which he made in 1829, he was introduced at Rome by Madame de Guiccioli to the Duchesse de St. Leu, Queen Hortense, whose house was one of the most agreeable resorts in the city.

'Here for the first time I met Hortense's son, Louis Napoleon, then just of age. Nor would anybody at that time have predicted his great and romantic career. He was a wild harum-scarum youth, or what the French call *un crâne*, riding at full gallop down the streets to the peril of the public, fencing, and pistol-shooting, and apparently without serious thoughts of any kind, although even then he was possessed with the conviction that he would some day rule over France. We became friends, but at that time he evinced no remarkable talent or any fixed idea but the one I mention. It grew upon him with his growth, and increased daily until it ripened into a certainty. He was a very good horseman and proficient at athletic games, being short, but very active and muscular. His face was grave and dark, but redeemed by a singularly bright smile. Such was his personal appearance in 1829, at twenty-one years of age.'

Lord Malmesbury's intimacy with these remarkable men would suffice to give a peculiar interest to his Memoirs, and indeed his principal object appears to have been to sketch their characters. But his own public career entitles him to a distinguished place in our political history. He speaks of it with becoming modesty, and with no wish to exaggerate its importance. But the reader of these volumes will be satisfied that he deserves a higher rank than that previously awarded to him by public opinion. It was not till 1846, after the disruption of the Tory Party, and the fall of Sir Robert Peel, that Lord Malmesbury entered upon active political life, and he entered upon it as the warm partisan of a lost cause. He never sat in the House of Commons, for although he once stood for Portsmouth and was a candidate for the Borough of Wilton in 1841, his father's death

at that very time placed him in the House of Peers. The strong excitement caused by the repeal of the Corn Laws roused his political energy, and he threw himself with ardour into the Protectionist party, led by Lord Derby, but condemned at the outset to abandon the cause of Protection. In 1852, when Lord Derby rallied the forlorn hope of the Tories and formed a Government, the Foreign Office was placed in his hands, although he was entirely without official experience, and his knowledge of diplomacy was derived from the careful study of his grandfather's despatches and correspondence, which he had recently published. But the love of letters and a ready appreciation of the foreign relations of the country and of the character of foreigners, with whose language and manners he was extremely familiar, were hereditary in the Harris family, and there is no trace in his correspondence of the hand of a novice. It was the opinion of his successors in office, Lord John Russell and Lord Clarendon, that the business of the department had been conducted with ability and dignity. Lord Malmesbury was never an ambitious politician. He accepted, more than he sought, the functions he was called upon to discharge, actuated mainly by a sense of duty to the House in which he sat, to the party which he had adopted, and to his country. When he took office in 1852, the recent *coup d'état* in France, which placed Louis Napoleon near the throne, had shaken the confidence of Europe, and raised in this country the liveliest apprehensions of what the renovated Empire might bring forth. Lord Malmesbury himself was viewed with suspicion from his known intimacy with the author of a revolution which was regarded in England as a detestable aggression on the liberties of France, and as an act dangerous to the peace of Europe. Here, however, his knowledge of the character and opinions of the future Emperor stood him in good stead. He firmly adhered to the conviction that peace and goodwill to England were the basis of the Imperial policy, and he was right; but at that moment a friendly reliance on the intentions of the ruler of France was unpopular in an English Minister.

As in 1852 Lord Malmesbury was accused of a leaning to France, so in 1859, when the Franco-Austrian war broke out in Italy, he was accused of a leaning to Austria, because at that time he strongly opposed the aggressive policy of Napoleon III., in the interest of the general peace. That war was more popular in England than it was in France,

because it had for its object the independence of Italy. But, however desirable that object was to the Italians, more than one statesman thought that it might be too dearly purchased by the overthrow of the existing settlement of Europe. Lord Malmesbury foresaw that this was the letting out of waters. He even predicted that in the long run it would cost the Emperor his crown or his life. And it would not be difficult to show that the series of events which followed in succession the first outbreak of the military ambition and activity of France did in fact lead up to that catastrophe. Lord Malmesbury applied himself with success to localise the war, which he had not the power to prevent; but his exertions, at the time, were singularly misrepresented and misunderstood.

Before we enter upon the more important passages to be found in these volumes, it is just to pay our tribute to their literary merit. The mere jottings of a diary have, of course, no literary pretensions, yet they sparkle with anecdote and incident, and they recall to memory a prodigious number of persons and occurrences, extremely amusing to those who, like ourselves, can remember the greater part of them, and perhaps not less interesting to later generations, who see these ghosts and shadows of the nineteenth century flit before their eyes. But when Lord Malmesbury allows his pen to run freely, no one writes more pleasantly. In his introductory chapter he brings before us the naval review of 1814, which Prince Metternich also witnessed in the Solent, and we mount the ancient galley of the Governor of the Isle of Wight, with its lofty gilded poop, dating from the days of William III. He describes with an 'eternal affection' that wild tract of moorland, stretching between Christchurch and Poole, in which the old manor house of Heron Court was planted by the Priors of Christchurch—a region now invaded by a thousand villas, but on which sixty years ago blackcock might be shot where the largest church in Bournemouth now stands, and where even the eagle and the bustard were not unknown. The last lesser bustard was shot there by Lord Palmerston.

At two-and-twenty he starts for the Continent, and escapes by a hair's-breadth from the wound of a fencing-master at Geneva, who runs him through the body with a broken foil; and again in the Sicilian seas from the wreck of a vessel in which he had all but embarked. Connected by his marriage with the family of the Duc de Gramont

(Lady Malmesbury was a granddaughter of the old Duc de Gramont, who arrested the Cardinal de Rohan at Versailles, and lived to tell the story fifty years afterwards); received as a confidential friend by the heir of the Bonapartes, whom he saw in all the vicissitudes of fortune, in England, at Ham, upon the throne in Paris, and upon his death-bed at Chislehurst; acquainted, as few Englishmen are, with every province of France by frequent excursions to that country, Lord Malmesbury's notes of French society and manners are of extraordinary variety and interest.*

And if we turn from Courts and Cabinets to his life in the Highlands, where he rented for many years the shootings of Achnacarry from Cameron of Lochiel, on the west coast, our author becomes the ardent and successful sportsman, passing months in that wild scenery which he knew how to describe and to enjoy. We must cite the following passage, which has something of the lightness of touch of our old friend Mrs. Barbauld:—

'September 29th.—A tremendous gale and rain. The whole party sat together in the drawing-room, each obliged to tell a story. Mine was as follows, and was founded on the fact that Richelieu had refused to shoot with Loughborough in consequence of his always hunting his pointers down wind:—

'There was once a young Highland shepherd, who was drinking at a burn, and being in the humour of desiring all sorts of things that he had never seen or possessed, he wished that one of the fairies he had heard of, who haunted the place, would appear and give him whatever he wanted. At that moment his dog howled, and a pixie stood before him. "I have heard you," she said, "as I sat under that pebble in the burn, and I will give you whatever you wish for, but it must be one thing only and for ever." "Thank you," said the lad, not at all alarmed, "I have only one desire in the world, and that is to go to sea and become a rich merchant." This happened before steamers were invented, and the fairy answered most graciously, "Mr. MacGuffog, I will give you what is the most essential thing for a prosperous voyage and successful trading—namely, wherever you go you shall have a fair wind whichever way you turn yourself or your ship." The young MacGuffog fell on his knees with gratitude, and having given the fairy a pull at his whisky-flask, went forthwith to

* Sometimes his transitions are rather abrupt, as if he thought that his readers had as good a memory as his own. Thus, after saying that Lady Tankerville, his mother-in-law, was a Gramont, he passes immediately to Count d'Orsay without explaining the connexion. The young Duchesse de Guiche, afterwards Duchesse de Gramont—a lady still alive—was Count d'Orsay's sister; the Count was therefore allied by marriage to Lady Tankerville's family.

Fort William, and enlisted as a cabin-boy on board a merchantman. It was not very long before the fact became known that whatever ship he was on board always had the wind astern; all the trading captains hired him at any price, but he soon gained enough to sail on his own account, and by the time he was thirty, the rapid voyages he invariably made cut out everybody else, and gave him such advantages that he realised a large fortune. He then remembered his native hills, and determined to buy an estate upon them. This he did, but he felt that he was not really a Highland gentleman without a deer-forest, and therefore he extended his domain, took off the sheep, and hired the best stalker in Scotland. All this being prepared for his happiness and amusement, he started with him to stalk in his own forest, but day after day he was disappointed by the perverseness of the weather, the wind constantly changing the moment he went out. Whatever circuits he took he found himself always going down wind, so that, whether as single deer or herds, no animal allowed him to approach within a quarter of a mile. He looked upon this merely as a piece of bad luck, till by chance, crossing the burn on which he had seen the pixie fifteen years before, he heard a tiny giggle and then a long low laugh. Turning round, he saw the little woman, and then the terrible truth broke upon him that if he lived to a thousand years he never could possibly kill a stag.'

We must here intercalate—for in this kaleidoscope diary incidents occur in a perplexing variety—Lord Malmesbury's very curious account of his visit to Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, then a prisoner at Ham, in April 1845:—

'*April, London.*—I am just returned from the Castle of Ham, on the Somme, where I have been to see Prince Louis Napoleon in the prison in which he has been confined since 1840. Early last January he sent M. Ornano to London to ask me to come and see him on a matter of vital importance to himself, bringing a small almanack for the year, with a vignette of the fortress of Ham painted in miniature on the cover. I was unable to go till now, and having obtained with some difficulty a permission from M. Guizot to see the Prince, I went to Ham on April 20. I found him little changed, although he had been imprisoned five years, and very much pleased to see an old friend fresh from the outer world, and that world London. As I had only half a day allowed me for the interview, he confessed that, although his confidence and courage remained unabated, he was weary of his prison, from which he saw no chance of escaping, as he knew that the French Government gave him opportunities of doing so that they might shoot him in the act. He stated that a deputation had arrived from Ecuador offering him the Presidency of that Republic if Louis Philippe would release him, and in that case he would give the King his parole never to return to Europe. He had, therefore, sent for me as a supporter and friend of Sir R. Peel, at that time our Prime Minister, to urge Sir Robert to intercede with Louis Philippe to comply with his wishes, promising every possible guarantee for his good faith. The Prince was full of a plan for a new canal in Nicaragua, that pro-

misused every kind of advantage to British commerce. As a precedent for English official interference I was to quote Earl Grey's in favour of Prince Polignac's release in 1830. I assured the Prince that I would do my best; but added that Lord Aberdeen was our Foreign Secretary, and that there was nothing of romance in his character. At this time Prince Louis was deeply engaged in writing the history of Artillery, and he took an hour in making me explain the meaning of several technical words in English, which he wished translated. He gave me a full account of his failure at Boulogne, which he declared was entirely owing to the sudden illness of the officer of the day whom he had secured, and who was to have given up the barracks at once. The soldiers had mostly been gained, and the prestige of his name in the French army was universal. To prove this, he assured me that the cavalry escort of lancers who accompanied him to Ham made him constant gestures of sympathy on the road. He then said, "You see the sentry under my window? I do not know whether he is one of *mine* or not; if he is he will cross his arms, if not, he will do nothing when I make a sign." He went to the window and stroked his moustache, but there was no response until three were relieved, when the soldier answered by crossing his arms over his musket. The Prince then said, "You see that my partisans are unknown to me, and so am I to them. My power is in an immortal name, and in that only; but I have waited long enough, and cannot endure imprisonment any longer." I understood that Count Montholon and Dr. Conneau, with his valet, Thelin, were his fellow-prisoners at Ham. After a stay of three hours I left the prison, and returned to London deeply impressed with the calm resolution, or rather philosophy, of this man, but putting little faith as to his ever renouncing [*qu. ?* mounting] the throne of France. Very few in a miserable prison like this, isolated and quasi-forgotten, would have kept their intellect braced by constant day studies and original compositions, as Louis Bonaparte did during the last five years in the fortress of Ham.

'The day after I arrived in London I saw Sir Robert Peel, and related my interview and message to him. He seemed to be greatly interested, and certainly not averse to apply to the French Government in the Prince's favour on his conditions, but said he must consult Lord Aberdeen, which of course was inevitable. That evening he wrote to me to say that Lord Aberdeen "would not hear of it." Who can tell how this decision of the noble lord may influence future history?' (Vol. i. p. 157.)

We are compelled, by the limits of this article, to pass over numerous anecdotes and incidents of sport, society, and travel, which our readers will find for themselves in Lord Malmesbury's pages, and we proceed to the more substantial portions of his work, which are the fit subjects of discussion and criticism.

Lord Malmesbury, as has been said, took his seat in the House of Lords in 1841, on the death of his father, who had

rather dissuaded than encouraged him to enter public life. He appears for some years to have taken no active part in politics, and although he had applauded Sir Robert Peel's gallant struggle in 1835, we think we can trace at a later period something of that distrust of their great leader which the High Tory Party did not care to conceal, and which ultimately broke out in the invectives of Mr. Disraeli. In 1839 Sir Robert Peel had 'implored the Conservatives to 'be united and not to split upon minor differences with 'respect to the Corn Laws, declaring himself to be in favour 'of the present system, against fixed duty or any alteration 'whatever.'* That was the shibboleth of the Tory Party. But many things occurred, after Peel's accession to office, to shake their faith. In 1843 Lord Malmesbury says: 'Many 'Conservatives think that Peel truckles to the Radicals, and 'throws over his friends;' and in the preceding year, 1842, he had actually brought in a Corn Bill:—

'February 7th.—Sir Robert Peel has brought in his Bill upon the Corn Laws, which is no less than taking off more than half the present duty. Nobody expected such a sweeping measure, and there is great consternation amongst the Conservatives. It is clear that he has thrown over the landed interest, as my father always said he would. . . . My steward says that the landed proprietors will lose at least 15 per cent. of their rents by Peel's bill.' (Vol. i. p. 139.)

To which Lord Malmesbury adds in a note that 'Experience 'has shown that this is far under the mark:' he does not appear to notice that rents had been artificially raised by the effect of the Protective system, which was precisely the grievance complained of by the nation. Sir Robert Peel was not unconscious of the rift in the party of which he was the illustrious chief, and even when his administration was apparently at the height of its power, he foresaw its dissolution. The studied silence of Lord Malmesbury with reference to the head of the Government in these years is significant. Lord Stanley appears to have been the only member of the Cabinet with whom he lived on confidential terms. Mr. Gladstone he did not even know by sight, for he writes on November 7, 1844:—

'November 7th.—Dined with the Cannings and met Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Phillimore. We were curious to see the former, as he is a man who is much spoken of as one who will come to the front. We were disappointed at his appearance, which is that of a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, but he is very agreeable.' (Vol. i. p. 155.)

Yet Mr. Gladstone had then been a distinguished member of the Conservative Cabinet for three years.

The decision of Sir Robert Peel and some of his colleagues to propose the repeal of the Corn Laws in December 1845 came, nevertheless, like a thunder-clap on the stout adherents to Protection and what was termed the Agriculturist interest. Lord Malmesbury seems, oddly enough, to have been told that the objection to Lord Palmerston as Foreign Minister, which led to the failure of Lord John Russell's attempt to form a Government at that time, proceeded from *Louis Philippe*—an absurd supposition! The objector, as is well known, was Lord Grey. However, Sir Robert Peel resumed office, and proceeded with his measure. Lord Stanley resigned for no other reason than his objection to Sir Robert's Corn Law policy, and the disruption of the Conservative Party took place. This roused Lord Malmesbury into action. He spoke in favour of Protection on the Address, and thenceforward took a prominent part in the organisation of the Tory Opposition. The details are curious:—

February 19th.—Returned to Heron Court from London, and saw Lord Stanley there, who is decidedly against Peel's measure, and though disinclined at present to take the lead of the Agricultural party, will certainly do so at some future period. He thinks that any attempt to form a Government at present from amongst our party would be premature, from the want of an experienced leader in the House of Commons, and the only way to rally and unite the party is in opposition. Therefore, the Whigs must first come in. The Duke of Wellington, though he supports the measure, is against it, and told Lord Stanley that his only reason for staying in and supporting Peel was for the sake of the Queen and the peace of the country. He deeply lamented that Peel had brought the measure forward, thought he was quite wrong, that he had broken up a noble party, and that it was for him (Lord Stanley) to rally it again, his own career was nearly ended, and that Stanley must be leader of the party. Lord Beaumont went to the Duke and asked him to grant him a committee for an inquiry into the burthen on land, and he first tried to persuade him to give it up, but finding him firm he said, "Well, my good fellow, you must have it. I will not oppose it; I am quite of your opinion on the subject; it is a d——d mess, but I must look to the peace of the country and the Queen." It is evident from his whole conduct lately this is his sincere opinion, for though he retains office he has never said a word in defence of Peel or his measure. He sits on the Government bench with his hat drawn over his face, apparently indifferent to all the attacks made on the Government, never saying a word in answer.

March 21st.—Lord Stanley is now established in the direction of the Protectionist party. He presented some petitions yesterday in favour of Protection, and took the opportunity of declaring himself

against Peel's Bill for repealing the Corn Laws. This will fix many waverers who have been inclined to vote with Peel though disliking his measure.' (Vol. i. p. 166.)

It is far too late in the day to criticise the conduct of Lord Derby and his friends on this occasion. But this disruption inflicted a blow on the Conservative Party from which it did not recover for thirty years; much larger interests than those of a duty on corn were sacrificed; many old ties of political allegiance were broken; and the ground taken up by the Protectionist party was so untenable, that their first act, when they came back to office, was to repudiate Protection.

Hostilities were carried on, as is well known, with great acrimony by Lord George Bentinck and Mr. Disraeli for several years. But in 1848 Lord George threw up the leadership of the Protectionists in the House of Commons, because he conceived himself to have been affronted by Mr. Beresford. He was succeeded by Lord Granby as leader. Mr. Disraeli's name was not put forward, though, as Lord Malmesbury shrewdly remarked, 'whoever in future may take the lead in the House of Commons by election, he must virtually and practically hold that office.' In the following September Lord George Bentinck died. A year later Mr. Disraeli wrote to Lord Malmesbury:—

'The scandal of our provincial movement is great and flagrant, but I hope the evil is more superficial than it seems, and that, with tact and temper, the ship may be righted. I have spared no effort, nor has Beresford, but we have had to deal with a wrong-headed man.

'Ever yours sincerely,

'B. DISRAELI.'

Was Mr. Disraeli already engaged in writing the panegyric of his late ally, which he called a biography?

Lord John Russell's administration was weak—weakened rather by internal dissensions in the Liberal Party than by the attacks of the Opposition, for the country was firm in defence of Free-trade, and the Tories were flogging a dead horse in their zeal for Protection. But on February 22, 1851, Lord John, having been beaten on a division on the County Franchise by Mr. Locke King, suddenly resigned. Lord Stanley was sent for by the Queen; on his failure to form a Ministry, an attempt was made to effect a coalition between the Whigs and the Peelites, which failed, from the refusal of Lord Aberdeen and Sir James Graham to support the Anti-Papal Bill. Lord Stanley then tried his hand again, and again failed; upon which Lord John resumed

office. We published Lord Aberdeen's account of this curious transaction a year ago in reviewing his correspondence.* We are now enabled by Lord Malmesbury to state what took place at the Conservative councils—a very characteristic and amusing account of the scene:—

'Lord Stanley to Lord M.

'St. James's Square: Feb. 25, 1851.

'Dear Malmesbury,—I must see you without a moment's delay. John Russell's attempted reconstruction has failed, the Peelites cannot form a Government, and I shall have to try my hand. Let me see you, if possible, in the course of to-morrow.

*'Yours ever,
'STANLEY.'*

'February 26th.—Lord John Russell has failed, and the Queen has again sent for Lord Stanley.

'February 27th.—All the Peelites have refused to join Lord Stanley, although he offered Gladstone and Canning Cabinet places—the former Foreign Affairs. [This is a mistake. The Foreign Office was offered to Sir Stratford Canning.] I think Lord Stanley will be unable to form a Government, but a few others and myself are to meet at his house at one o'clock, when it will probably be decided whether he gives up the attempt or not. My impression is that he will do so. Lord Aberdeen refused to attempt the task of forming a Cabinet, and yet the Peelites decline to join either the Whigs or us. I can't imagine what they want, for, being the weakest party in the country, they can't hope to govern by themselves.

'February 28th.—We met at Lord Stanley's in St. James's Square, and have failed in forming a Government. He had previously requested me to take the Colonial Office, which I consider a great compliment, as it is one of the hardest worked of places. Those assembled were—Mr. Disraeli, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Walpole, Lord Hardwicke, Mr. Henley, Mr. Herries, Lord John Manners, and Lord Eglinton. Everything went smoothly, each willingly accepting the respective post to which Lord Stanley appointed him, excepting Mr. Henley, who made such difficulties about himself and submitted so many upon various subjects, that Lord Stanley threw up the game, to the great disappointment and disgust of most of the others present. Mr. Henley seemed quite overpowered by the responsibility he was asked to undertake as President of the Board of Trade, and is evidently a most nervous man. Mr. Disraeli did not conceal his anger at his want of courage and interest in the matter. Lord Stanley had written to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, who was at Constantinople, asking him to take the management of Foreign Affairs, which he at once consented to do. In the House of Lords, Lord Stanley announced his failure, and did not conceal it as being caused by the want of experience in

* Edinburgh Review, vol. clviii. p. 554.

public business which he found existed in his party. This is probably the case, but what really caused the break up of the conference was the timid conduct of Mr. Henley and Mr. Herries.

'*March 1st.*—Lord Stanley's speech was a fine one, manly and straightforward, but I fear it will discourage his party. He says, alluding to them: "A party, numerous no doubt, but still undoubtedly in a minority in the House of Commons on several occasions, and which unfortunately, though it no doubt numbers in its ranks men of talent and intellect, contains, I will not say no single individual, but hardly one individual of political experience and versed in official business. I feel that is a great disadvantage for any party to labour under; but there is a third party in the House of Commons, not indeed very extensive numerically, but most important as regards official experience and the talents of the great portion of its members. I mean that small party, in point of numbers, which has adhered to the policy of the late Sir Robert Peel." This will appear to many as rather praising his opponents at the expense of his friends, and it will have the effect of making the former more difficult to deal with, and at the same time give discouragement, if not offence, to his own party. He then states the financial measures he would have proposed if he had come into office. His plan was to put on five shillings fixed duty on corn, and take threepence off the income tax preparatory to its total repeal, whenever the revenue of the country admitted it. Lord Stanley told me afterwards that "the total want of decision in Mr. Herries and Mr. Henley made him see at once that they would be of no use. The latter seemed frightened rather than pleased at being in the Cabinet, and appeared paralysed." This was quite true. As to Herries, he looked like an old doctor who had just killed a patient, and Henley like the undertaker who was to bury him. The difficulties Lord Stanley would have had to contend with were also very great—a majority against him in both Houses, the Mutiny Bill not passed, supplies not voted, and the time not favourable for a dissolution of Parliament—all confirmed him in his determination to give up the attempt; and he accordingly went to the Queen at five o'clock and announced his failure. The Queen had authorised him to say that if he had asked for a Dissolution she would not have refused. The Duke of Northumberland would have had the Admiralty. The Queen has sent for the Duke of Wellington to ask his advice. I expect that Lord John will reconstruct his ministry *tant bien que mal*, and that even the Peelites will join it. I called upon Lady Stanley, who seems in great spirits at her husband not being in office.' (Vol. i. pp. 277–80.)

We have previously had occasion to advert in this journal to the character and achievements of Mr. Herries, in terms which drew down some clumsy missiles on our head; but it is astonishing to find, on such irrefragable evidence, that an individual of his calibre should, twice in his life, have stood in the way of the formation of a Cabinet.

In December 1851 came the *coup d'état* which made Louis

Napoleon the master of France. He had told Lord Malmesbury some months before : ' You see my position ; it is time to put an end to it.' He made no secret of his intention of being beforehand with his enemies, and there was no mistaking the means he would take to be so. Lord Palmerston he believed to be in his favour, though Lord Normanby, then Ambassador in Paris, was openly hostile to him. But the *coup* which placed Louis Napoleon so near the throne drove Lord Palmerston from the Foreign Office : in a few weeks he took his *revanche*, and in February 1852 the Whig Ministry was at an end. The hesitation of the preceding year was not repeated. Disraeli, we are told, was no longer ' mopy, but never wrote and spoke in a more sanguine tone ; ' a Cabinet was formed of men who had never been in office. Lord Derby said, ' I am driving a team of young horses ; ' not one of them had ever been in harness before, and they ' went beautifully—not one kicked amongst them.'

The Duke of Wellington said he had never heard the gentlemen's names. Lady Clanricarde asked Lord Derby whether he was sure Sir John Pakington was a *real* man ? To which he replied, ' Well, I think so ; he has been married ' three times.' In this combination Lord Malmesbury assumed the responsible duties of Foreign Secretary.

As to the vexed question of Protection, the following statement of Lord Derby's views is important. It is contained in a letter to Lord Malmesbury :—

' I continue to think that a recurrence to duties on imports, including corn, is desirable both on financial and on political grounds ; and I can neither abandon this belief, nor a line of policy founded on it, until a general election has convinced me that that which I think the best thing for the country is an unattainable good. Should the country prove not to be with us, I should feel absolved from the duty of protracting a hopeless struggle, which, while it continues, must cause serious injury by the uncertainty it creates as to the final result ; but to take office as a Protectionist, and then spontaneously abandon the principle of Protection, would involve a degree of baseness, from the imputation of which I should have hoped that my " antecedents " (to borrow a French expression) might have relieved me.' (Vol. i. p. 299.)

But the country was not ' with us,' and Protection was abandoned.

In fact, the main interest of the situation lay in foreign affairs and in the uncertain, perhaps menacing, future which the accession of a Bonaparte to power opened to Europe. In this conjuncture, Lord Malmesbury's intimacy with the Prince, and his knowledge of his character, served him well

and was of use to his country. Lord John Russell, who had just turned out Lord Palmerston for his approval of the *coup d'état*, was regarded as hostile. The Liberal sentiments of the country were outraged by the violence and brutality of the attack on the constitution of France. The English press was vehemently excited, with the exception of the 'Morning Post,' which, it seems, was taken into the pay of the French Government. Even those who regarded the act itself as excusable and necessary were filled with distrust as to the future policy of the successful conspirators. Under these circumstances, the following letter to the new Secretary of State was important, and we add to it the handsome communication he received from Lord Palmerston, who was free at that moment to join either party:—

'From Louis Napoleon, Prince President, to Lord M.

'Elysée : 24 février 1852.

'Mon cher Lord Malmesbury,—Je ne veux pas tarder à vous féliciter du poste élevé où la confiance de la Reine vous a appelé, mais je m'en félicite surtout pour les bons rapports qui doivent en résulter pour les deux pays. Nous avons reçu ici avec grand plaisir Lord et Lady Cowley, et nous serions très-heureux si le changement de ministère ne les entraînait pas à sa suite. Croyez, mon cher Lord Malmesbury, que vous trouverez toujours mon gouvernement franc, loyal, animé des sentiments les plus amicaux, et prêt à s'entendre avec le vôtre pour tout ce qui peut assurer la paix et les progrès de la civilisation.

'Je vous renouvelle l'assurance de ma sincère amitié.

'LOUIS-NAPOLÉON.'

'Lord Palmerston to Lord M.

'C. G. : February 24, 1852.

'My dear Malmesbury.—I shall be happy both on personal and public grounds to give you any information which I can give, and which you may think useful to you, with reference to the state of our foreign relations, and I will either receive you here or call upon you, as best may suit you, at any time most convenient to you to-morrow. Your time is not entirely at your disposal, mine is at my own command ; I shall, therefore, await your appointment.

'Yours sincerely,

'PALMERSTON.'

Lord Malmesbury did not share the apprehensions of some of his colleagues, and of many of his correspondents. He believed in the resolution of Louis Napoleon to live on good terms with England, although he carefully watched his public conduct, and he expressed to Lord Cowley (who had

just succeeded to the Embassy in Paris) an opinion of his personal character in these terms :—

‘I believe you are aware of my having formerly had an intimate acquaintance with the President, an accident that he has had the *maladresse* to put forward ostentatiously in his newspapers. When I was appointed, and before I kissed hands, I received from him a letter of congratulation, expressing in the strongest terms his peaceable intentions and desire of promoting civilisation. I enclose a copy. I answered it in my *private* capacity. There is no reason you should not allude to this letter (which the *Queen* has seen), and tell him how satisfactory its receipt is to this Government. Before the last Government resigned, and about a month since, I wrote to him a strong remonstrance on the subject of the Orleans property decrees. He replied, with continued and repeated assurances of friendship to England, but declared the confiscation necessary, as even some of his own new Senators had been tampered with by Orleanist agents and money. This is quite a *marotte* with him, and Walewski is strongly against him on this point. You may depend upon his being a man of action and counsel, depending on no other agent but his own inspirations, but with great self-command and power of self-denial if his passions are at variance with his interests. He is very superstitious, and was formerly very accessible to romantic and chivalrous impressions, and in private transactions most jealous of his *word* and his *honour*. I give you these hints (*experto crede*), because you will at once see their value where future events must depend on the single will of one man.’

And some months later, when the proclamation of the Empire was evidently approaching (October 1852) he wrote to Lord Derby :—

‘All you say about the French President’s views has been for a long time on my mind. *Everybody* agrees with you, and the feeling of apprehension is universal. I hear it from various quarters—from Brougham and his French correspondents, from my private secretary Harris and his French relations, and, in short, from what must be considered the best authority for *prophecy*. This general terror of what is coming is a *presentiment*, for none can give any reasons founded on facts to show the sinister feelings and intentions of Louis Napoleon. I believe I stand alone, therefore, in disbelieving them; and these are my arguments :—He has no natural dislike to the English. Ever since I knew him, he courted their society and imitated their habits. Twenty years ago, when he could not have been playing a part with me—who had even less chance of being Foreign Secretary than he of being Emperor—he always said that his uncle’s great mistake was not being friends with England. I never knew him to hint at revenge for his degradation at St. Helena, but it is possible that that sentiment may rankle in his breast. Assuming that it does, and that eventually he intends if possible to indulge it, why should he go such a roundabout way to make war with us as through the Belgian Guarantee? Now, since Louis Napoleon has been in power, he has

lost no opportunity of showing friendly feeling. If a Consul has been disagreeable, he has had him trounced; if we wanted his help, as in Egypt and Cuba, he gave it at once. He has avoided pointedly every subject of dispute, and has with this feeling just expressed a wish again to negotiate for the exchange of the territories of Albreda and Portendie. So with regard to our tariff. If Disraeli was ready, we might now get a quasi Free-trade treaty with France. The belief after all this that the President is concocting a great scheme against England can, therefore, only be called a *presentiment*; but it nevertheless does exist throughout his own country and ours. Material circumstances also militate against it. If our informers are correct, the French dockyards never were more sluggish. I write all this to you, not of course to recommend supineness, for I would not reduce a single ship or seaman, and I trust Disraeli's scheme will not require *that*, but only to give you my opinion of the man's nature, feelings, and intentions at present. I believe that he is convinced that war with England lost his uncle the throne, and that he *means* to try *peace* with us. He wants to marry and have heirs, and I do not at present see that the 7,000,000 who have twice elected him, and will do so again, require the "fireworks." The first time he was elected he did not know twenty people in all France by sight. The second, he had just committed a gross act of public violence. Neither his obscurity nor notoriety made any difference, and I believe his *name* to be enough to sustain him among the masses for *his* life, and I do not foresee the circumstances that are to force him out of his course.'

The allusion to a Free-trade treaty with France, to be effected by the ex-Protectionists, is extremely curious, and the following letter from the Chancellor of the Exchequer to Lord Malmesbury shows what he was ready to do, and also what he thought of the Colonies:—

'Mr. Disraeli, Chancellor of the Exchequer, to Lord M.

'Hughenden: August 13, 1852.

'My dear M.,—I return you Lord Cowley's confidential despatch. I am not disposed to reduce our duties on French brandies to obtain a reduction of their duties on our coals. We had better leave our mutual tariffs as they stand, unless the French are willing to treat these matters on a much more extensive scale. If they would reduce their duties on linen, yarn, cottons, or iron, I should recommend our meeting them with reductions on their brandies and silks. The latter would be a great card for France. We ought now to be for as complete Free-trade as we can obtain, and let the English farmer, and the English landlord too, buy the best and the cheapest silks for their wives and daughters.

'In case anything is to be done in this respect, it should be done with as little knowledge by the Board of Trade as practicable. That office is filled with our enemies. Lord Cowley, therefore, should conduct the business entirely; or we should send some confidential and circumspect agent of our own.

'It is useless now to vex ourselves about the Protectionist rock ahead. If this section exist, it can do nothing until the financial statement is made. Every expression of opinion on their side will be suspended until they have heard our financial measures. I confess I have no great fear of them, and I think they and their constituents will be satisfied.

'The Fisheries affair is a bad business. Pakington's circular is not written with a thorough knowledge of the circumstances. He is out of his depth, more than three marine miles from shore.

'These wretched colonies will all be independent too in a few years, and are a millstone round our necks. If I were you I would *push matters* with Filmore, who has no interest to pander to the populace like Webster, and make an honourable and speedy settlement.

'Yours ever, 'D.'

But these 'financial measures' were precisely the rock on which the ship struck. Mr. Disraeli's budget was rejected by a majority of nineteen in the House of Commons on December 17, and Lord Derby at once resigned.

In November 1852, an attempt had been made to strengthen Lord Derby's Cabinet, to which the following entries relate. It was by no means impossible that it might succeed, but we believe Mr. Disraeli's position in the House of Commons was the chief obstacle.

'November 24th.—Wrote to Lord Derby on national defences. We went to Windsor. Conversation on state of affairs and reforming Lord Derby's Cabinet. He was of opinion that he could not do without Palmerston, Gladstone, and Sidney Herbert. Lonsdale and Hardwicke were ready to resign and make room.

'November 25th.—Lord Derby had full power from the Queen to arrange a Government and fusion on two conditions—namely, that Palmerston was not to lead the Commons. He had been last night with Disraeli and said he had nothing to do with the Peelites. They declare through Lord Jocelyn that they will go with Palmerston if he is leader of the House of Commons. No one to negotiate with.

'November 28th.—Saw Lord Derby. He averse to letting Palmerston into Cabinet alone. I think him wrong. If he, Gladstone, and Herbert came into it, he would be overwhelmed in the Commons by this portion of the Cabinet. Nor would I object to Palmerston and Herbert. I cannot make out Gladstone, who seems to me a dark horse.'

If the Conservative Party had been reconstituted at that time, with these additions, it would probably have materially altered the course of human affairs.

We pass over several topics of minor interest which engaged Lord Malmesbury's attention in 1852; but within a few days of the fall of the Derby Government two remarkable incidents occurred. The one was the official recognition of the French

Empire, which took place on December 4, after a somewhat puerile discussion respecting the numeral III. attached to his name, which was got over by an express declaration on the part of the new Emperor that he acknowledged all the acts that had taken place since 1815—such as the reigns of the elder Bourbons and of Louis Philippe; and, secondly, that he laid no claim to *hereditary* right to the throne of France, but only that by election. The French Government gave a written assurance of this interpretation of Napoleon III., and the Emperor repeated it to the Senate.

No sooner was he proclaimed Emperor, than Louis Napoleon sought to marry. The treaty with the Princess Wasa was broken off, and on December 13 the French Ambassador formally asked the hand of Princess Adelaide of Hohenlohe (a niece of the Queen of England) for his master. The offer was also made to the father of the Princess, who was, perhaps, not indisposed to accept it. But the decision rested, in reality, with Queen Victoria. Lord Malmesbury went to Windsor on December 28 to deliver up the seals of office.

‘When I went into the room her Majesty began on the subject of the proposed marriage of her niece. The Prince read a letter from Prince Hohenlohe on the subject, which amounted to this, that he was not sure of the settlement being satisfactory, and that there were objections of religion and morals. The Queen and Prince talked of the marriage reasonably, and weighed the *pros* and *cons*. Afraid the Princess should be dazzled if she heard of the offer. I said I knew an offer would be made to the father. Walewski would go himself. The Queen alluded to the fate of all the wives of the rulers of France since 1789, but did not positively object to the marriage.’

We believe that her Majesty’s unfavourable presentiment did eventually prevent the marriage. But the most amusing part of the incident is, that on January 29, *just one month after this proposal*, the Emperor’s nuptials with Mlle. de Montijo took place in Notre Dame.

Our limits compel us to pass over the intervening years between 1852 and 1858, although they were marked by events of no ordinary importance—the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny. But Lord Malmesbury was out of office during this period, and though he chronicled the course of these occurrences in succinct but agreeable language, he speaks of them as one of the public, free from personal responsibility.

Early in 1858 an important and sudden change came over the scene. On January 14 an atrocious attempt was made by Orsini, an Italian refugee. Three grenades were thrown at

the Emperor's carriage at the door of the Opera-house. The royal cortège narrowly escaped. The Emperor's hat was torn, and his forehead scratched. The number of persons wounded was 102. Never was there a narrower escape; never did the act of a desperate conspirator produce more important effects on the politics of Europe. It shook the nerves of Louis Napoleon, and plunged him into the whirlpool of Italian politics, which ultimately led to war and broke up the treaties of 1815. It nearly led to a quarrel with England, and actually caused a change of Ministry in this country; and as minor events follow in the train of violent causes, it brought back Lord Malmesbury to the Foreign Office. The grenades thrown by Orsini were manufactured in England; the conspiracy had been matured in this country. Two, at least, of the persons implicated in it—one of them being a Frenchman, Bernard—were still residing in London. In France, a cry of indignation was raised against the asylum afforded by England to refugees who were conspiring against the life of an allied and friendly sovereign. We have had some recent experience of the feelings excited by conspiracies carried on with impunity in foreign countries against the lives and property of our own citizens. As the law stood, a man could not be prosecuted for being an accessory to a murder committed abroad by one foreigner upon another, and the British Government had no power to grant the extradition of Simon Bernard if the demand had been made. Subsequently, he was tried for a misdemeanour at the Old Bailey, and although the facts were proved, he was disgracefully acquitted.

On February 9 Lord Palmerston, being anxious to give some satisfaction to the not unjust irritation of the French, brought in a bill to make conspiracy to murder a felony instead of a misdemeanour. The first reading of the bill was carried by a majority of 299 against 99, Mr. Disraeli and the Tories supporting it. But, meanwhile, the threats of the French colonels had produced great irritation here. The Radical party fiercely opposed the bill, and when Mr. Milner Gibson moved a hostile amendment on February 20, the majority of the Conservatives supported him, and the bill was thrown out by 234 to 215. We have always considered this as one of the most flagrant violations of principle ever committed by an Opposition, and it was done not without encouragement from one of the Conservative leaders who had previously expressed his approval of the measure. The immediate result was the resignation of Lord Palmerston.

and his colleagues, and the return of the Tories to power, on the back of a refusal to grant any satisfaction to the French Government.

The second Derby Government did not differ materially from the first. Lord Malmesbury returned to the Foreign Office. Attempts were made to enlarge the basis of the Cabinet, but they did not succeed. The following entry is remarkable:—

'March 2nd.—Lord Grey said to Lady Tankerville that he would have joined Lord Derby's Government if it had not been for Mr. Disraeli, and that Mr. Gladstone would also have joined him had he been offered the leadership of the Commons.'

Lord Malmesbury's first care was to allay the irritation of the French—not an easy task, and it was rendered more difficult by the violence of M. de Persigny, then French Ambassador in London.

'March 6th.—M. de Persigny is furious at our party coming into office, as he is devoted to Lord Palmerston, and instead of assisting me to restore the friendly feeling lately subsisting between England and France, has done all he can to prevent my attaining that object; not only by relating to Lord Palmerston all that passes between us, but by writing letters to the Emperor to increase his irritation. My impression is that the Emperor is pretending to be more angry than he really is to please the French; but that, if we are firm, he will give way, and intends to do so. I believe, however, that the late attempt on his life has greatly shaken his nerves, that he is spoilt by a life of ease and pleasure, and does not stand being shot at as well as he used to do.' (Vol. ii. p. 103.)

But Persigny was at daggers drawn with Count Walewski, then Foreign Minister in Paris. A conciliatory despatch from Downing Street was well received. Persigny resigned, and to his great disgust his resignation was accepted. And on the first meeting of the House of Commons after the adjournment Mr. Disraeli was able to announce that an answer had arrived giving full satisfaction to England and that the dispute was at an end.

'March 20th.—Dined at Lady Molesworth's last night, where we met the Palmerstons and Madame de Persigny, who was crying at her husband's having given up the Embassy. She still seemed to hope they might stay. At that moment Persigny arrived, walked straight up to her, without noticing anybody else, and whispered in her ear. She got up, and went into another room, he following; and they walked about the rooms, out of one into another, in a state of great agitation. Persigny ended by rushing out of the house, to the amazement of the company, to none of whom had he said a word!'

Such scenes were not uncommon between this excitable lady and her 'cher petit Victor;' when they visited the Malmesburys in the Highlands, her conduct was still more offensive and burlesque. M. de Persigny was succeeded by Pélistier, the Duc de Malakoff, a singular diplomatist, but who was favourably impressed by his reception in this country. In truth, the relations of France and England were entirely carried on in Paris by Lord Cowley, whose personal influence with the Emperor was great, and who had the unbounded confidence of his own chief. The foreign policy of that eventful year, when several delicate questions came under discussion, was as much the work of Lord Cowley as of Lord Malmesbury himself.

But few weeks have elapsed, at the present time, since the close of the life of that eminent diplomatist and excellent man, although he has long been withdrawn by physical infirmities from the public service. The publication now before us is an opportune tribute to his great desert. It fell to the lot of Lord Cowley to act as British Ambassador in Paris during the whole period of the Second Empire. By him our alliance with France was strengthened; by him our differences with France were allayed. Though reserved and somewhat cold in manner, no representative of the Crown ever defended its interests with greater warmth and dignity. His judgement was unclouded; his conduct unshaken. He served Ministers of both sides in England with equal fidelity, and amidst the fluctuations of party in this country, and the storms and gusts which passed over France or gathered on her horizon, Lord Cowley contributed more than any other man to preserve the uniform traditions of our foreign policy in the interests of peace, and to exercise a moderating influence over the adventurous sovereign whom a series of revolutions had placed upon the throne.

Lord Malmesbury had not been long in office before he perceived that the Emperor in 1858 was a very different man from the Emperor in 1852. 'He had lost all his sense of rights and prudence, and is acting on passion.' 'A complete plan for the invasion of England by Admiral de la Gravière, made in 1857, is in my possession.' These are ominous sentences. Before the close of the year rumours of war gained consistency, for in fact at that very time the negotiation between the Emperor and M. de Cavour was going on at Plombières, and on January 1 the Emperor's declaration showed what was in store for Austria. From

that moment Lord Malmesbury directed all his exertions to avert, or at least to localise, the impending war. He was, therefore, in direct opposition to the policy of the Emperor, who first attempted to deceive him and Lord Cowley by false assurances, and afterwards resented the opposition of England with great bitterness. The motive of the hostility of the French Government, and of M. de Persigny in particular, to Lord Derby's Administration, was that, from Lord Palmerston's well-known enthusiasm for the cause of Italy and aversion to Austria, backed by the influence of the Italian Minister in London and Signor Panizzi, who were his intimate friends, the French hoped that if Lord Palmerston were in office he would aid and abet them in the Italian war. This was so true that at a subsequent period, on his return to office, Lord Palmerston proposed to the Cabinet an offensive and defensive alliance with France and Italy; but the majority of his colleagues did not share his opinion, and the proposal was overruled.

The view of Lord Malmesbury and the Derby Ministry was, on the contrary, that this, the first outbreak of French military action on the continent of Europe, whatever might be the motive, was a flagrant violation of the pledge 'L'Empire c'est la paix;' that it would break up the existing treaties and settlement of the Continent which had weathered the storm of 1848; and that this campaign would lead to further conflicts, of which no man could foresee the end, and possibly to a general war. Nor was this opinion peculiar to the Tory Party. It was shared by Lord Clarendon; it was defended at the time by ourselves. It was argued that, although an amelioration of the condition of Italy was highly desirable, it was perilous to all nations to effect it by letting loose the armies of France. So in fact it has proved. Territorial aggrandizement has followed in the rear of conquest; provinces have been seized and annexed by great States; new combinations have arisen by which France herself has been the chief loser; Europe has ever since been crushed by enormous armaments; and no system of alliances, based on public law and a general European Treaty, has as yet been restored.

Foreseeing these dangers, the manifest traditional policy of England was to labour in the cause of peace, and if unhappily war ensued, to proclaim her absolute neutrality between the contending parties. Lord Malmesbury's letters to Lord Cowley prove that this was the course he adopted.

'Lord M. to Lord Cowley.

'Heron Court: January 7, 1859.

'My dear Cowley,—I will send you a very important paper in a few days (the Queen must approve of my reply first), which I have got from Bloomfield, asking me on the part of the Prussian Government what we mean to do if Austria and France go to war. I have answered, neutrality at all events, and as long as possible. We are ready, if Austria and France choose to join, to improve the Legations, to give our moral support, and even to consider a reconstruction of the *Central* territory if we see hopes of improving the condition of the people without weakening the spiritual authority of the Pope; but we will not consent beyond this to any alterations in the territorial arrangements of 1815, which have ensured the longest peace on record.

'Lord M. to Lord Cowley.

'Foreign Office: January 11, 1859.

'My dear Cowley,—You will see that we have taken a line, and I leave you to carry it out with your usual straightforward exactness. If the Emperor cares for the public opinion of this country, he must be made to understand that it will be against the aggressor, whoever he may be, who is the first cause of a European war. That it will cost him his life or his crown I have not the least doubt. Eventually, as it spreads, Germany is sure to be found united against the Latin nations; therefore it is as a friend I wish to warn him before he decides at his age and in his position on such a *coup de dés*. Persigny went back yesterday to intrigue against Walewski and her Majesty's present Government. . . . Of course you will see the Emperor himself, and give all the solemnity you can to the advice, leaving all the consequences and calamities of a European war on his head if he begins, or *allows Sardinia to begin*.'

'January 12th.—The King of Sardinia has made a speech which can only mean war. Things look bad all over Europe, and it will be very difficult to avert a general war if Louis Napoleon wants one. Great panic in Paris, and war very unpopular. The Emperor is getting alarmed at the feeling in France and the extraordinary fall in the funds; also at the unpopularity of the marriage arranged between Prince Napoleon and the King of Sardinia's daughter. Lord Cowley writes that he was much depressed at his ball; but I believe it is his fear of assassination, which haunts him perpetually, and has robbed him of all his former courage and coolness. It is driving him on to war, thinking that by supporting the cause of Italian nationality he will disarm those men who, in his earlier days, were his confederates in Carbonarism, and to whom he is pledged by former promises, and perhaps oaths. Cavour, knowing these facts, works upon them to induce him to take part openly with Sardinia. Austria is behaving with a folly which is perfectly inconceivable considering her position surrounded by enemies on all the frontiers. But what can one expect from Buol? I care for neither Austria nor France, but Lord Derby

and I are determined to use every effort to prevent war, which would cost 100,000 lives and desolate the fairest parts of Europe. My whole mind is occupied by that object.' (Vol. ii. p. 148.)

The British Government does not appear to have been aware of the extent of the engagements entered into at Plombières in the preceding autumn, between Louis Napoleon and M. de Cavour, including the cession to France of Savoy and Nice. But they knew enough to perceive that no reliance could be placed on any assurances of the two Powers; that every form of deceit was resorted to; and that it was what Lord Malmesbury calls 'an abominable *trame*.' The mission of Lord Cowley to Vienna, where he went to counsel moderation to the Austrians, and the subsequent proposal of a Congress, which Louis Napoleon assented to in order to gain time to complete his armaments, were mere fetches. A Congress based on a general disarmament was 'a fool's paradise;' Lord Cowley had proofs enough of 'the broken promises and falseness of the Emperor.' It was evident that his deliberate intention was war. Subsequent disclosures have proved that he had bound himself hand and foot to Cavour.

But, however strongly the British Government might condemn the dishonest and aggressive policy of France, it was wholly untrue that any attempt was made from London to organise the resistance of the other German Powers against her, although Louis Napoleon had been led by false information to believe it. Prussia had acted a wise and friendly part. She viewed with alarm the outbreak of war, and an attack on Austria in her Italian dominions. She sounded England as to her intentions in the event of the war becoming general. To this overture, Lord Malmesbury replied by an emphatic declaration of neutrality, and by strenuous advice to abstain from interference on the part of the German Powers. This important despatch was never shown to the Emperor Napoleon by his Minister, to whom it was communicated; and it was not published in England until the moment when the Ministry was tottering to its fall, as Mr. Disraeli had neglected to lay the Blue-book before the House of Commons. The despatch was as follows:—

'Foreign Office : May 2, 1850.

'Sir,—I have to acquaint you that her Majesty's Government witness with great anxiety the disposition shown by the States of Germany to enter at once into a contest with France. Her Majesty's Government cannot perceive that at the present moment Germany has

any grounds for declaring war against that Power, and still less would the Confederation, in their opinion, be justified in prematurely adopting any course which would bring on a European war.

‘It is desirable, however, that the Governments of Germany should entertain no doubt as to the course which in such a case her Majesty’s Government would pursue, and therefore you will explicitly state to the Government to which you are accredited that if Germany should at present, and without a *casus fœderis*, be so ill-advised as to provoke a war with France, and should, without any sufficient cause, make general a war which on every account ought, if possible, to be localised, her Majesty’s Government determine to maintain a strict neutrality, can give to Germany no assistance, nor contribute by the interposition of the naval forces of this country to protect her coast from hostile attack.

‘The elections now proceeding afford an undeniable test of public feeling on this point, and it may be said to be the only one in which the English people appear to be at the present moment absorbed. That Germany should arm and prepare for eventualities is natural and right, but in the opinion of her Majesty’s Government no act has as yet been committed by France against Germany, and no treaty obligation subsists which justifies her to provoke an attack on her own territory or an invasion of France.

‘I am, &c.

‘MALMESBURY.

‘Both I and Count Walewski had received intelligence that the whole of the Prussian army was to be mobilised in consequence of the strong feeling in Germany against France.’

Whilst these events were going on abroad, Parliament was dissolved; and on the meeting of the new House of Commons a hostile amendment to the Address was moved and carried by a vote of 323 to 310—a majority of 13. Lord Derby immediately resigned. The foreign policy of the Government was not fully debated or understood, for the materials had not been laid before the House of Commons.

‘Thus fell,’ says Lord Malmesbury, ‘the second Administration of Lord Derby. With a dead majority against him, it is evident that he could not for long have maintained his ground, but it is equally certain that he would not have been defeated on the Address if Disraeli had previously laid on the table the Blue-book containing the Italian and French correspondence with the Foreign Office. Why he chose not to do so I never knew, nor did he ever explain it to me; but I presented it to the House of Lords at the last moment when I found he would not give it to the House of Commons, and at least twelve or fourteen members of Parliament who voted against us in the fatal division came out of their way at different times and places to assure me that, had they read that correspondence before the debate, they never would have voted for an amendment which, as far as our conduct respecting the war was concerned, was thoroughly undeserved, we having done everything that was possible to maintain peace. Mr.

Cobden was one of these, and expressed himself most strongly to me on the subject. It may be asked why Lord Derby did not himself order this Blue-book to be produced; but the fact was that he wished to resign, worn out by repeated attacks of gout and the toil of his office, and was indifferent to continuing the struggle. When, a few days after, the Blue-book was read, I received as many congratulations upon its contents as during the past year I had suffered attacks from the Opposition and from the "Press," and many members repeated over and over again that, had they read it, they would not have supported the amendment.' (Vol. ii. p. 189.)

Upon the announcement of the division, the Marquis d'Azeglio, Italian Minister, threw his hat in the air, screaming with delight, and embraced M. de Jaucourt, the French Chargé d'Affaires, in the lobby of the House. They hoped for the continuance of the war with the support of England. Peace, however, was not far off. In a month from that time the preliminaries were signed at Villafranca, to the great disappointment of the ultra-Italian party of M. de Cavour, although Sardinia gained Lombardy by the bargain. M. de Persigny gave Lord Malmesbury, soon afterwards, a strange account of the transaction, perhaps not more true than several other statements of that personage, but it deserves to be cited:—

July 21st.—Persigny came to give me the account of how the peace was brought about. M. de Persigny, after the armistice, by the Emperor's order, went to Lord Palmerston and said that the time was come for meditation, and suggested conditions—namely, Venice and its territories to be taken from Austria, not annexed to Sardinia, but made into a separate and independent State. There were other conditions, but this was the principal one. That Lord Palmerston agreed to this, and rode down to Richmond to tell Lord John Russell, who was equally delighted; and that the proposal was adopted by them and sent to the Queen, who was at Aldershot, which occasioned some delay. That her Majesty refused her consent, saying the time was not come yet to make these proposals, as the fortresses were not taken. That, however, in the meantime, Persigny had telegraphed the consent of the English Government to his master, who immediately asked for an interview with the Emperor of Austria, showed him Persigny's despatch, saying, "Here are the conditions proposed by England and agreed to also by Prussia. Now listen to mine, which, though those of an enemy, are much more favourable. So let us settle everything together, without reference to the neutral Powers, whose conditions are not nearly so advantageous to you as those I am ready to grant."

The Emperor of Austria, not suspecting any reservation, and not knowing that the Queen had refused her consent to these proposals, which, though agreed to by her Government, were suggested by Persigny evidently to give his master the opportunity of outbidding us, and making Francis Joseph think that he was thrown over by

England and Prussia, accepted the offer, and peace was instantly concluded.

‘Louis Napoleon in his speech to the Senate and Chamber, who waited upon him at St. Cloud, acknowledged fairly that he could not have taken the fortresses, if at all, without too great a sacrifice of life, and also that it would have entailed a general war and revolution all over Europe.’ (Vol. ii. p. 201.)

The Emperor Napoleon had been led to believe that Lord Derby’s Government was irreconcilably hostile to the liberation of Italy, and to the French Government which had resolved to effect it, as far as concerned North Italy, for the Emperor’s schemes as to the rest of the Peninsula were vague and impracticable. Hence a coolness had sprung up between Louis Napoleon and his old friend Lord Malmesbury. Some years afterwards (in 1861), being in France, Lord Malmesbury requested an audience of his Majesty, at which he explained that the policy of England had been strictly neutral, and that, in point of fact, her remonstrance had prevented Prussia and the German States from joining Austria when the French and their allies crossed the Ticino. The Emperor admitted that he was not aware of it, but he was out of humour with England, and railed at Lord Palmerston’s preparations of defence. In fact, the relations of the two countries were not improved by the change of Ministry. The cession of Savoy and Nice was regarded here as a base, underhand transaction; Lord John Russell declared in the House of Commons that he would not sacrifice the alliance of the rest of Europe for the sake of France, and Persigny, who had been the *âme damnée* of Lord Palmerston the year before, now abused him as loudly as he had abused his predecessors in office. He even behaved ill to Lady Palmerston in Countess Apponyi’s house.

Lord Malmesbury’s official connexion with the Foreign Office ended with the fall of the second Derby Administration. Upon the return of the Conservatives to office in 1866, he declined so laborious an office, and accepted that of Lord Privy Seal; and on the withdrawal of Lord Derby he became the leader of his party in the House of Lords. The account he gives us of the distracted councils of the Cabinets of 1866, when the Tories turned Reformers, and introduced the most democratic measure ever proposed to Parliament, is extremely curious and amusing, but our limits forbid us to enter upon the tangled web of domestic politics, and we shall confine ourselves to those passages of this interesting work which complete the narrative of his relations with the Emperor

Napoleon. They met again in the spring of 1870, when the *plébiscite* had just been repeated to confirm the liberalised constitution under the Ollivier Ministry. Lord Malmesbury dined at the Tuileries on May 19.

‘After dinner the Emperor invited the men to the smoking-room, where he took me aside, and I had a remarkable conversation with him. I naturally began by congratulating him on his *plébiscite*, which was just counted up, but I found that he was not satisfied, as some 50,000 of the army had voted “*Non*.” He, however, explained that this had taken place in certain special barracks where the officers were unpopular and the recruits numerous, and that 300,000 soldiers had voted for him. This immediately struck me as strange, for I imagined his army was in numbers 600,000, and I made the remark, to which he gave no reply, but looked suddenly very grave and absent. He observed later that Europe appeared to be tranquil, and it was evident to me that at that moment he had no idea of the coming hurricane, which suddenly broke out the first week of the following July.

‘His tone was altogether more sedate and quiet than I found him formerly employing. No speculative and hypothetical cases were discussed by him, and I feel sure that not a thought of the impending idea of a Hohenzollern being a candidate for the Spanish throne had crossed his mind. Count Bismarck had kept it a profound secret, and that very deep secrecy and sudden surprise is the strongest proof of his intention to force a quarrel upon France. The Emperor did not conceal, in his conversation with me, his disappointment in regard to Italy, which had become free, and then was under one sovereign; and he recognised that a great number of his own subjects considered that he had committed a terrible political error in being the cause of creating a strong and growing kingdom on the very frontier of France and in the Mediterranean.’ (Vol. ii. p. 414.)

Within two months from this interview war was declared, and the Duc de Gramont, whose mismanagement at the provocations of Prussia under Bismarck must always be cited as the most incapable diplomacy on record, gave the following account of that event to Lord Malmesbury:—

‘The Hohenzollern candidateship to the throne of Spain was abandoned, and he declared that the Emperor was decidedly disposed to accept this renouncement and to patch up the quarrel, and turn this result into a diplomatic success, but his Ministers had avoided no opportunity of publishing the insult to France, and the Press stirred the anger and vanity of the public to a pitch of madness, but none had taken advantage of this characteristic temper of the Emperor. Before the final resolve to declare war the Emperor, Empress, and Ministers went to St. Cloud. After some discussion Gramont told me that the Empress, a high-spirited and impressionable woman, made a strong and most excited address, declaring that “war was inevitable if “the honour of France was to be sustained.” She was immediately followed by Marshal Le Bœuf, who, in the most violent tone, threw

down his portfolio and swore that if war was not declared he would give it up and renounce his military rank. The Emperor gave way, and Gramont went straight to the Chamber to announce the fatal news.

‘Such was his account to me of the most momentous transaction which has occurred in Europe since 1815. In it I do not see in the Emperor the same man who, with so much caution and preparation, bided his time before he attacked Austria in Italy in 1859, and who with such rare perseverance after years of failure and prison raised himself to what appeared to the world an impossible throne. I attribute this change in the Emperor, first, to his broken health and acute sufferings, and the loss of the character of mind, which had been weakened and diluted since he renounced his personal rule for the advice of responsible Ministers.’

On May 20, 1872, the ex-Emperor landed at Dover, where he was touched by the kindly and respectful reception he met with from the English people, and on the following day Lord Malmesbury visited him at Chislehurst.

‘After a few minutes he came into the room alone, and with that remarkable smile which could light up his dark countenance he shook me heartily by the hand. I confess that I was never more moved. His quiet and calm dignity and absence of all nervousness and irritability were the grandest examples of human moral courage that the severest Stoic could have imagined. I felt overpowered by the position. All the past rushed to my memory: our youth together at Rome in 1829, his dreams of power at that time, his subsequent desperate attempts to obtain it; his prisons, where I found him still sanguine and unchanged; his wonderful escape from Ham, and his residence in London, where, in the riots of 1848, he acted the special constable like any Englishman. His election as President by millions in France in 1850; his farther one by millions to the Imperial Crown; the part I had myself acted as an English Minister in that event, which had realised all his early dreams; the glory of his reign of twenty years over France, which he had enriched beyond belief, and adorned beyond all other countries and capitals; his liberation of Italy—all these memories crowded upon me as the man stood before me whose race had been so successful and romantic, now without a crown, without an army, without a country or an inch of ground which he could call his own, except the house he hired in an English village. I must have shown, for I could not conceal, what I felt, as, again shaking my hand, he said: “A la guerre comme à la guerre. C’est bien bon de venir me voir.” In a quiet natural way he then praised the kindness of the Germans at Wilhelmshöhe; nor did a single complaint escape him during our conversation. He said he had been *trompé* as to the force and preparation of his army, but without mentioning names; nor did he abuse any one, until I mentioned General Trochu, who deserted the Empress, whom he had sworn to defend, and gave Paris up to the mob, when the Emperor remarked, “Ah! voilà un drôle.” During half an hour he conversed with me as calmly as in the best days of his life, with a

dignity and resignation which might be that of a fatalist, but could hardly be obtained from any other creed; and when I left him that was, not for the first time, my impression.

‘When I saw him again in 1871 I found him much more depressed at the destruction of Paris, and at the anarchy prevailing over France, than he was at his own misfortunes; and that the Communists should have committed such horrors in the presence of their enemies, the Prussian armies, appeared to him the very acme of humiliation and of national infamy.

‘On January 9, 1873, he died in the presence of the Empress, who never left him, released from the storms of a fitful existence, from intense physical suffering, and saved from knowing the loss of his only son, whose fate she was soon destined to deplore alone.’

No doubt there was enough in the magnitude of the catastrophe, and in the dignity with which the Emperor bore his lost fortunes, to awaken these touching sentiments in the heart of an old—a lifelong—friend. But history pronounces a sterner judgement. The Second Empire was brought about by deceit and violence; it was an epoch of despotic administration and profligate expenditure, which extinguished in France the very sense and capacity for constitutional freedom; and it ended by calamities far greater to the nation that bore them than to the man who caused them. On this, and on many other political topics, it is natural that we should differ from Lord Malmesbury, who has played for so many years a distinguished rôle in the party whose views are generally opposed to our own. But we wish to part on the best possible terms from a writer to whom we are indebted for so agreeable and instructive a publication. Lord Malmesbury writes entirely without affectation, without prejudice, and without passion. He remains what he has always been—a staunch member of the Tory party. He has taken the course in politics which he conceives to be most consistent with the principles of his friends and the welfare of the nation; but the social relations he has maintained through life with men of various opinions, and the tone in which he generally speaks of his political antagonists, show that on the great questions that affect the dignity and welfare of England men are less widely divided than they are apt to imagine, when they are governed by the sentiments of a gentleman and a patriot.

ART. V.—1. *Vingt Années de République Parlementaire au Dix-septième Siècle: Jean de Witt, Grand Pensionnaire de Hollande.* Par M. ANTONIN LEFÈVRE-PONTALIS. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1884.

2. *History of the Administration of John de Witt, Grand Pensionary of Holland.* By JAMES GEDDES. Vol. I. 1623–1654. 8vo. London: 1879.

THE recent death of the Prince of Orange and the imminent extinction, in the direct male line, of a family which through so many centuries has been the crown and keystone of the arch of Dutch independence, give a peculiar interest to the opportune publication of a *Life of John de Witt*, the central figure in the struggles of the seventeenth century, who rose to power on the crest of the great republican wave, and whose tragical death marked an important epoch in the constitutional history of his country. It is some five years since Mr. Geddes issued the first volume of a work on this subject; a work of great labour and research, but utterly wanting in proportion, and written in such a strained and contorted language, that it is not surprising that the author has not been encouraged to continue his task. We must, however, regret this; for, notwithstanding its clumsiness of manner, it has a real historical value, and, so far as it goes, forms a useful commentary on the later work of M. Lefèvre-Pontalis. This is drawn almost entirely from original sources, letters or other documents, private or public, to which the author has had access in Holland or in France, and which he has examined with an industry and completeness worthy of our warm acknowledgements. One important point, indeed, he has unfortunately neglected. He would almost seem to have forgotten that in affairs, whether civil or naval, in which English diplomatists or English admirals bore a large part, there was a possibility that English books and English records might contain some important matter tending to confirm, to modify, or to confute views derived solely from the study of Dutch or French writers. His references to English published works are but few, and references to English MSS. are altogether wanting. He has thus been led into occasional mistakes as to fact, and more often, perhaps, as to inference.

Another point to which we are compelled to call attention as seriously detracting from the value of the work, is the extreme inaccuracy with which statements involving figures have been printed. No reliance can be placed on any of

them. If they are references, the pages are wrongly numbered, as in vol. i. p. 151 *n.*, where a reference to 'Thurloe's 'State Papers,' vol. i. pp. 569, 570, is printed 269, 270; if sums of money, the amount is wrongly given, as in vol. i. p. 339, where 24,000 'tonnes d'or' is printed instead of 24. Dates are the worst, and give rise to a chronological confusion which is at once grotesque and embarrassing. Some of these may be mere typographical errors, such as 1633 (i. 227 *n.*), or 1653 (i. 229 *n.*), both for 1655; but it can scarcely be the printer's fault that Tromp's death in August is announced in a letter dated 15th April, 1653 (i. 147 *n.*); that the reply to a letter dated 29th February is dated 25th February, 1672 (ii. 254 *n.*); or that a date is given 8-19 July (ii. 465 *n.*). Mistakes of this kind are much too frequent, and tend to make the study of the work both difficult and unsatisfactory, for it is not always possible for the reader to correct them. It is a point to which we would earnestly beg the author's attention before the book runs to a second edition.

According to the date adopted by M. Lefèvre-Pontalis, John de Witt was born at Dordrecht on September 24, 1625,* though Mr. Geddes prefers the statement inscribed in the records of the University of Leyden, that in October, 1641, he was eighteen years old, and dates his birth in 1623. For several generations his family had ranked as distinguished citizens of Dordrecht; his father, Jacob de Witt, was six several times re-elected burgomaster of that town, was its deputy in the States of Holland, which he represented in the States General; in 1644 was ambassador of the United Provinces in Sweden, and was still there when, early in 1645, he received news of the death of his wife, the mother of John, of another son Cornelis, two years older, and of two daughters. The two brothers had by that time finished their studies at Leyden, and in the following October left home for a tour through France and England. This extended over a period of nearly two years, the greatest part of which was spent in France—not all, indeed, in mere pleasure; for at Angers, where they arrived just six weeks after leaving Dordrecht, they remained three months, and graduated as Doctors in Law. After travelling through the south of France, they returned to Paris in October 1646, and in May 1647 crossed over to England, where they stayed little more than six

* We give the dates throughout in continental, or New Style, unless otherwise noted.

weeks; during which, in London, they 'saw both the Houses of Parliament, the tombs at Westminster, the Tower with the animals, and the beautiful tapestry;' on June 14 they began a small tour through the country, visiting Hampton Court and Windsor; Basingstoke, and 'saw in passing the ruins of Basing House;' Salisbury, and 'saw on the way Stonehenge, a place where a great many large stones, very old, are standing in the ground, with some others laid across above them.' They went on to Bristol, returning by Bath, where John 'had a bath three times;' through Marlborough 'to Sir John St. John's, a gentleman dwelling at the mansion at Lidiard, who showed us much courtesy, and we shot a stag in his park;' to Oxford, 'where we saw almost all the colleges and the library, which is very beautiful;' and so back to London. On July 23 they were at Gravesend, whence they took ship for Holland. The journal of the tour, kept by John, is extremely meagre, and is in fact little more than a note of places visited and expenses; but is not without interest, as indicating a stage in the education of the two young men whose future career is an important chapter in the history of the two countries.

Very shortly after their return the brothers were sworn in as advocates in Holland, and Cornelis was appointed to a minor magistracy in Dordrecht. John appears to have devoted the next two years to the practice of law at the Hague, and to have occupied much of his leisure with the study of mathematics, and more especially of the then novel co-ordinate geometry, on which he contributed a paper to a collection published in 1659 by Francis Schooten, professor of mathematics at Leyden.* As well as mathematical treatises, John de Witt is said to have written verse; and a translation into Dutch of Corneille's 'Horace' has been attributed to him. Mr. Geddes inclines to the opinion that the translator was a different man of the same name. M. Lefèvre-Pontalis will not agree to this, though he admits that the translation does not do much honour to John de Witt's poetical genius, adding, as an excuse—

'He never had leisure to perfect himself in writing poetry, nor even to

* The title of this essay is 'Johannis de Witt Elementa curvarum linearum, edita operâ Francisci à Schooten;' and the preface—in which he speaks of it as the work of former days when he had leisure for such studies, and says he should like to make it more perfect, if only more important business would permit—is dated at the Hague, October 8, 1658.

cultivate in prose the elegance in which his letters, public or private, are commonly deficient. He was ignorant of the art of polishing or adorning his style, or of decking it out with those artistic turns familiar to his contemporaries. . . . Neither his letters nor his other writings contribute to give him any literary reputation.'

But this, as it appears to us, is strong evidence against his having published a volume of verse in his youth; for, however bad the verse may be, a man can scarcely have seriously given himself up to its composition without acquiring the taste and the habit of attending to the choice of his words and the construction of his sentences. But however this may have been, it is quite certain that up to the autumn of 1650, when he was at least twenty-five years of age, and possibly twenty-seven, John de Witt had taken no active part in public affairs, and that he was called to it by the exigencies of the times and by the endeavour of the Prince of Orange to maintain and extend his authority as Stadtholder.

Ever since the first achievement of the independence of the Provinces, there had been a jealousy between the two parties of the State; it had been found impossible to assign constitutional limits to the authority of the princes, and the Republicans suspected them, with or without reason, of a wish to extend their power beyond that of the chief magistrate. There were thus frequent disagreements and struggles, which at times became very bitter, and in 1619 had culminated in the victory of the Prince's faction and in the execution of Barneveld, whose story has been so well told by Mr. Motley. Maurice's brother and successor, Frederick Henry, had governed the Dutch people and commanded the Dutch armies during the last twenty years of the Thirty Years' War. Under his rule, at once gentle and firm, the violence of parties had been checked, and in face of the general danger the necessity of concord and of submission to military rule had been admitted. But when, in 1647, Frederick Henry died, and was succeeded by his son, William II., who had already been elected to the survivance of his offices, the necessity for submission on the one hand, the calm and judicious exercise of power on the other, came to an end.

The young prince's sister had married the Elector of Brandenburg; he himself had married Mary, the daughter of Charles I. of England and niece of Louis XIII. of France. The princess, born in November, 1631, was still little more than a child, with a child's ambition: daughter of kings on both the father's and mother's side, she wished that her

husband should be also a king; should be free from the restraints of a democratic form of government, and be able to carry the whole resources of his kingdom to the assistance of her persecuted father. Nor was the prince unwilling. The stringent limitation of his authority by the States General was distasteful to him; their determination to maintain the Peace of Munster took away from him the opportunity of military glory, and their resolution to reduce the army to a minimum deprived him at once of the semblance and the reality of power. On this point the States of Holland were firm. They contributed more than half the expenditure of the Confederation; the cost of the army on a war footing caused them an annual deficit of eight million gulden, or, in round numbers, about 650,000*l.* sterling; and this army was, from the point of view of their foreign policy, useless, and of their domestic policy, dangerous. Between the young Stadtholder on the one side, and the States General on the other, there was thus a dispute of continually increasing bitterness. It was on Holland that the struggle, as the burden, principally fell; for the States of the other Provinces were not unwilling to support the Prince, whose family they loved, against the States of Holland, whose predominance they feared. Nevertheless, after long and angry disputes, Holland carried its point; the army was reduced from 60,000 men to rather less than 30,000; and, as a measure of precaution, a resolution was passed, on July 27, 1650, that neither the Stadtholder nor the States General could interfere with or control the councils of the several towns without their own consent.

This brought matters to a climax. On July 30 the Prince, on the pretence of conferring with them as to the crisis, had six of the principal members of the States of Holland separately arrested; and at the same time, by a sudden attack with the troops at his command, he attempted to seize on Amsterdam, which had taken a very prominent share in the resolutions against him. In the darkness of the night, however, the soldiers lost their way, the surprise failed, and the attempt was rendered impossible. Negotiations were entered into, and the town, doubtful of support, agreed to admit the Prince, but not his army. The semblance of concord was patched up, and, after a captivity of three weeks, the six imprisoned members were released.

The truce, however, was but a hollow pretence; the two parties were only waiting for some opportunity which they

might turn to their own advantage. It came to the States of Holland in a most unexpected but decisive manner. On October 27 the Prince of Orange was feverish and indisposed; on the 29th his illness was recognised to be small-pox; and on November 6 he died, at the early age of twenty-four. His son, the future William III. of the United Provinces, and, later on, of England, was not born till eight days afterwards, November 14. For the time being, the power of the Prince's party was completely broken. The name of Loevestein, where the six members had been imprisoned, was a rallying cry for all opponents; and the extremity of the danger from which they had escaped rendered it little likely that they would neglect their advantage. 'These fellows'—wrote the French Ambassador on November 23—'show that they mean to profit by the occasion, and to assume the government to themselves;' and so generally was this understood that Milton, then Latin Secretary to the Council of State, addressed to the States General his emphatic felicitations on the opportune death of the Stadtholder.

Their advantage was intensified by the divisions in the House of Nassau. The little baby was exceedingly frail: it was doubted whether it could live; and its mother and grandmother fought bitterly as to who was its natural guardian. They united only in their common hostility to the Count of Nassau, Stadtholder of Friesland and Gröningen, a soldier of distinction during the war, commander of the army under the late Prince, and leader of the attempt against Amsterdam; but whom the Princesses now considered rather as a rival than a defender of the young head of the house. The course of the opposition was thus easy, and they were able to carry out their determination not to permit the government to pass into the hands of a regent as though it descended to the Prince by hereditary right. The several States, including those of Zealand, which had always been most loyal to the Prince's cause, and many of the towns, declared the powers exercised by the late Prince to have lapsed; and before the Stadtholdership was declared vacant, it was shorn of all its high privileges; whilst, to complete the constitutional change thus effected, the States of Holland summoned a Grand Assembly of the Confederation to meet at the Hague in January, 1651.

To the great bulk of the people the question at issue appeared to be between popular independence or a personal government tending to become monarchical. To those who

understood the situation, it was something very different: it was whether the United Provinces should be one republic governed by the States General, and by the Stadtholder wielding their executive power, or whether they should be a mere congeries of petty republics, confederated indeed for some purposes, but remaining, for the most part, sovereign states, independent of each other. This last was the view favoured in Holland, which by its wealth, and its large contributions to the expenditure of the Confederation, might well claim a deciding voice in all public matters, but which had only one vote in the States General, and was on exactly the same footing as the poorest or least important Province. To the nation at large the question was represented as the struggle for liberty against the tyrannical usurpation of the Princes of Orange. By the leaders of the movement in Holland it was understood to be the struggle for the dominance of their own State; and in the infancy of the prince, by the discord between the two dowager princesses and the younger branches of the family, and by a judicious mixture of plausible appeals to the love of independence and of implied threats of breaking up the Confederation, they were able, for the time being, to succeed in their endeavours, and to abolish the office of Stadtholder, together with those of Captain and Admiral-General, which had hitherto concentrated all the executive power in the hands of one man.

A great constitutional change, a revolution in fact, was thus accomplished, and happily without either riot or bloodshed. The Orange party, disorganised and without a head, could do nothing but submit. Of the victors, the leaders were the six deputies whom William II., in attempting his *coup d'état*, had judiciously thrown into prison; and foremost amongst these was Jacob de Witt, father of the two young lawyers Cornelis and John, who, as a necessary consequence of success, were now thrust into prominent positions by the new government. On December 21, 1650, John was appointed Pensionary of Dordrecht, in which capacity he represented the town in the States of Holland, and would seem to have at once won the good opinion of his colleagues; so much so, that when, in April 1651, it was determined to send a special deputation to the States of Zealand to dissuade them from proposing a Captain-General, he was nominated a member of it, and appears to have acted as its secretary.

For eight months the Great Assembly of the States sat,

discussed, and, willingly or unwillingly, agreed to these weighty constitutional changes, the understanding of which is the key to the history of the United Provinces for the next twenty years. The reduction of the army was doubtless a measure of financial necessity, though carried to excess in conformity with party prejudices; but the resolution not to appoint a Captain-General broke up the force, small as it already was, into a number of petty independent contingents, whose unification at any time was rendered extremely difficult. Holland's was the largest, amounting to nearly half of the whole; those of the other Provinces were in proportion to the sums paid, but each was subject only to the particular Province which paid it; by the civil authorities of that Province the officers were appointed; to them they swore allegiance; and without their consent troops could not be moved in the Province, and still less out of it. Similarly with the navy. The larger part, paid by Holland, was subject to the States of Holland alone; but the rest, owing allegiance only to the States of their own Province, formed a fleet which might, or, according to circumstances, might not, act as one united whole. War could not be declared, peace could not be made, without the unanimous vote of the States General; nor had the representatives freedom to vote on any special motion without a direct and special authorisation from the States of their several Provinces. In doing away with the overshadowing offices of Stadtholder and Captain-General, the object of the statesmen of Holland was undoubtedly to secure for themselves the virtual rule of the Confederation. The result was rather the resolving it once again into its component parts, putting serious obstacles in the way of any united action, and offering the republic a prey to intestine strife and foreign aggression.

The collapse of the Orange party as a power in the State seemed, however, to augur well for the maintenance of friendly relations with the Commonwealth of England. These had, indeed, been severely strained since victory in the Civil War had declared for the Parliament. The late prince, influenced by his wife, the Princess Royal of England, would willingly have given active support to the king's cause; and though he had not been able to do so, still, from the very first, the Dutch ports had been bases of royalist operations. It was from them that supplies of arms and money had been sent over. It was from them that, in February 1643, the Queen had sailed 'in a States' man-of-war assigned

‘by the Prince of Orange, with others for her convoy,’ bringing for the king ‘a good quantity of ammunition and ‘arms,’ which Batten had rudely forbidden her to land. It was to them that, in 1648, this same Batten and his brother officers carried over a considerable part of the fleet, in revolt against the military command which was being forced on them; and it was again from Dutch ports that Prince Rupert’s privateers had fitted out, or to them that they had brought in their prizes. Though no active assistance had been rendered, the whole English policy of the States General, as controlled by the Princes of Orange, had been in favour of the royalists. This was now suddenly changed, a fact which the royalists were quicker to mark than the Parliament. The royalist cruisers, pirates rather than men-of-war, at once included Dutch merchant ships in the list of lawful spoil, and from their stronghold in the Scilly Islands inflicted severe loss on Dutch commerce. It was to put a stop to these depredations that Tromp was sent, with a powerful squadron, to the entrance of the Channel. The Council of State suspected that he proposed to attack the marauders in their lair, possibly to take possession of the Scilly Islands; a contingency which Blake, then commanding in the Irish Seas, was ordered to prevent. Whatever instructions had been given to Tromp, we may conclude that they did not go the length of directing any action distinctly hostile to the Parliamentary fleet; and he returned to his own country without any further achievement than that of having roused the suspicion and the jealousy of the English Government.

It was just before this that the Council of State had determined on sending a special embassy to the States General. On a previous occasion the Prince of Orange had refused to receive one; but it was now more than ever necessary that there should be a distinct understanding between the two countries; and there were strong hopes that a common republicanism and a common Protestantism might bring them into a very close alliance. On the other hand, there were many grievances on both sides. From an English point of view, the conduct of the Dutch in the East Indies had been for many years hostile and aggressive; the commercial treaties had been violated, and no redress had ever been made for the ‘Massacre of Amboyna,’ thirty years before; the murder of Doreslaus in May 1649, and the equipment of Prince Rupert’s cruisers, though committed by Englishmen, had been connived at, if not directly sanc-

tioned by the Dutch Government; and though that had been happily changed, it was still desirable to obtain security against the recurrence of such injuries. On the part of the Dutch it was alleged that their fishing had been interfered with, their fishing vessels illegally seized, and that many piracies, under the name of reprisals, had been committed. No doubt much might be said for and against the various claims on both sides. The Massacre of Amboyna seems now the most serious; but that it was not so considered then is proved by the fact that it had been left standing over for thirty years, and that the compensation ultimately agreed on was of very trifling amount. All the alleged grievances might, and probably would, have been arranged, had there not been at bottom another and more serious difficulty—the commercial rivalry, which was felt not in the East only, but all over the world; and which, with the rapid development of the trade of both nations, was becoming every day more and more keen. The real problem before the diplomatists on each side was how to convert this rivalry from a mutual danger into a mutual advantage; and it proved to be one which they were not at that time able to solve.

The ambassadors, Oliver St. John, Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, and Walter Strickland, formerly Resident at the Hague, with their secretary, Thurloe, and a brilliant and numerous train, made a formal entry into the Hague and had a ceremonial audience of the States General on March 30, 1651, when commissioners were appointed to conduct the negotiation, which was doomed to drag through a weary three months, and to be broken off without any satisfactory result. The circumstances attending this, however, M. Lefèvre-Pontalis appears to have misunderstood. He says:—

‘Puffed up by their success in overthrowing royalty, the English Government had given way to the temptings of inordinate ambition. The Parliamentary ambassadors were charged with the obtaining the consent of the States General to the union of the two countries under the authority of one common Grand Council, which should hold its sittings in England. This was equivalent to demanding of the United Provinces the sacrifice of their independence by subjecting themselves to the will of the stronger State. The association of one great, compact, and united republic with a confederation of provinces, having each its own separate government, would be a very leonine sort of partnership, in which England would have everything to gain, the United Provinces everything to lose. With one accord, therefore, the States General rejected a proposition which would have reduced the republic to servitude, or at least to vassalage. The imperious demand for the banish-

ment from Dutch territories of the English princes and their followers, was received with no greater favour; and the Parliament began to be irritated at not being able to dictate its orders.'

For all this, M. Lefèvre-Pontalis cites no authorities, nor, indeed, can he have any, except such as rest on mere fancy or on popular report; though Mr. Geddes, equally without authority, surmises that, in general terms, the object of the ambassadors 'was to propose, in all honesty, a complete 'coalescing of the two republics.' That a French writer, systematically ignoring English authorities, should relate as fact this singular figment of imagination, is, perhaps, not to be wondered at; but Mr. Geddes, who has consulted the English records, and refers directly to the official narrative of the embassy, would almost seem to have deliberately preferred speculation to the evidence which he might have found had he looked farther. For, in fact, the evidence on this point is unusually clear, and establishes beyond a doubt that no such proposition as that detailed by M. Lefèvre-Pontalis was even mooted by St. John or Strickland. To prove a negative is proverbially difficult: we are in the happy position of being able to accomplish that difficulty. It is not merely that the proposal actually made is on record, the wording of which is distinct enough * without any mention of such a union as M. Lefèvre-Pontalis describes, or of that coalescing which Mr. Geddes speaks of; it is rather that we have the positive assertion of the Dutch Commissioners some two years later, when the war was raging violently and another negotiation was being carried on in London. Such a proposition was then put forward, and on the part of England it was declared that—

'this State is willing to expect the [necessary] security by uniting both States together in such manner as they may become one people and commonwealth for the good of both. . . . The whole so united to be under one supreme power, to consist of persons of both nations, according as shall be agreed upon, and to have and enjoy the like privileges and freedom in respect of habitations, possessions, trade, ports, fishing, and all other advantages whatsoever, in each other's countries as natives, without any difference or distinction.' †

To which the Dutch Commissioners replied,

'that the proposition in such terms was unexpected, they having never

* A brief narrative of the Treaty at the Hague . . . begun upon the 20 March, 1650 [O.S.], and continued until the 20 June, 1651, and then broke off *re infectâ*. Foreign Office Records, Holland, 213. It is referred to by Mr. Geddes, p. 163.

† July 21, 25 (O.S.), 1653; Holland, 214.

seen nor heard in any of the propositions and conferences of former times the least mention of a coalition or mixture of the several sovereignties ;' and they were ' fully persuaded that such imaginations had never been in the thoughts of either.' *

Now this proposition, so made and so refused in the summer of 1653, is certainly included in the more comprehensive one which M. Lefèvre-Pontalis attributes to St. John in the spring of 1651 ; and the affirmation of the Dutch Commissioners that such a proposition had never been heard of before, nor even imagined, may be held to be absolutely conclusive.

St. John's proposal did, however, include ' a more strict ' and intimate alliance and union ' between the two countries ; and this, being referred by the commissioners to the States General, was received by them with ambiguous and protracted delays. They wished to be told the details of this ' more ' intimate union,' and St. John would only reply that it was needless to go into details unless they were agreed on the general proposition. The States General were unwilling to give a categorical answer to this ; they were afraid lest ' the ' intimate alliance ' might involve them in active war against the king in Scotland, and they wished to see how ' the Scotch ' mist ' would end. They separated for Easter, and prolonged the recess to nearly double the usual length in order, as they said, to consult the several Provinces and towns.† At length, after a month's delay, the States General accepted St. John's proposition, which he then elaborated into a proposal, ' that ' the two commonwealths may be confederated friends, joined ' and allied together for the defence and preservation of the ' liberty and freedom of the people of each.' To this the States General would not or could not give any answer. The necessity of again consulting the towns was their excuse. Wearied out with the delays, the Parliament ordered the ambassadors to return ; and, though they afterwards gave forty days' extension of the time, nothing was accomplished, and the embassy embarked for England on June 30.

This is, in brief, the history of the diplomatic part of the

* July 27, 1653, *ibid.*
August 6

† Mr. Geddes says that St. John ' insinuates ' this. As St. John, or his secretary Thurloe for him, states it in plain and positive language as a thing of which he had personal knowledge, Mr. Geddes's use of the word ' insinuates ' is not one warranted by the dictionary or by custom.

embassy. It is, however, not to be doubted that the personal part had an almost equal share in the failure of the negotiation. From the very first the populace of the Hague conceived an ill-will to the gentlemen of the embassy. This is said to have sprung out of the English custom of wearing the sword in the streets, which gave the idea that they were afraid;* and the English royalists, noticing this, egged the street boys on to insult them. That the populace did offer insults to the Embassy is thus admitted; but the insults principally complained of were offered by royalists of high position; and notably by Prince Edward,† who, with abusive language, knocked St. John's hat off in the public street and in the presence of the Duke of York, ordering him to respect the son and brother of his king. St. John drew his sword; both parties did the same; and there was the immediate prospect of a set combat, when the populace intervened, overwhelmed the ambassador's followers, and compelled them to seek safety in hasty flight.‡ It was said that it was the Duke of York who knocked off St. John's hat; it was certain that he was in the fray and approved of the conduct of his followers. The States General sent complimentary apologies to the ambassadors, and privately requested the Duke to leave the town. He did so, but only for a short time. He presently returned; and, with his sister, with an imposing suite and a train of the mob, used to ride daily past the ambassador's house, staring at it in an insolent manner, which the train understood as an incentive to break the windows; but, beyond compliments and apologies to St. John, or a meek request to the Princess Royal to keep her attendants in order, no redress for these outrages and insults could be obtained. It was rumoured that St. John would meet with the same fate as Doreslaus or Ascham; and though this was falsified by the event, it is impossible to say that it was not based on royalist intentions; if so, the ambassador owed his safety neither to scruples on the part of the would-be assassins, nor to the watchful care of the Dutch authorities, but only to his own guards and the swords of his retainers. It is therefore not to be wondered at if his sympathies were not enlisted in the cause of the Dutch; if his report was not too favourable to them; or if the Parliament, having failed to win them to a close alliance or confederation, stood strictly on

* Tideman, 'De Zee betwist,' p. 38.

† Son of the Queen of Bohemia, and brother of Prince Rupert.

‡ Basnage, 'Annales des Provinces-Unies,' vol. i. p. 215.

their own rights and interest, and passed the celebrated Navigation Act, October 9-19, 1651.

This at once put an end to a very lucrative branch of the Dutch carrying trade; and the Dutch, who felt the injury, not unnaturally thought and said at the time, as their historians still say, that the Act was passed in a spirit of revenge because they had refused St. John's proffer of alliance: 'an evidence,' says M. Lefèvre-Pontalis, 'of the arrogant and aggressive policy of the English Government.' It is, however, matter of history that the principle of the Act had been recognised in England as far back as the time of Richard II., when, in 1382, a very similar measure was enacted as a means of reviving the maritime strength of the country. In the time of Henry VII. the idea again came prominently into notice, and the importation of certain commodities named had been prohibited, except in English ships manned by English seamen. This was repeated in the early part of Elizabeth's reign; and all through the first half of the seventeenth century the feeling of the commercial classes was loudly expressed in favour of still more rigid clauses. In 1624 the merchants of London had petitioned that the export of herrings in foreign bottoms might be forbidden: in 1646, the Prohibitory Act had forbidden all exports in foreign ships from any of the ports of America; and this, in 1650, was extended also to imports unless with a licence. The Navigation Act of 1651 was thus the natural sequence of a course of legislation extending over two centuries and a half; it must have followed even if there had been no mission to the States General; and nothing could have prevented the ships of the United Provinces being included in its restrictions except the 'more intimate union' which had been offered. Though the date of the Act was, probably enough, determined by the rejection of the treaty and by the insults to which St. John had been exposed, the facts that it was re-enacted in 1660, and that, notwithstanding the great and revolutionary changes in the Government, it remained in force for 200 years, afford sufficient proof that it was the act of the nation, not of any one man nor of any private pique.

Ever since the departure of St. John the Dutch had talked of sending an embassy to England, but as yet no steps had been taken. The passing of the Navigation Act and the renewed issue of letters of reprisal woke them up to the necessity of immediate action. Father Cats, better known to posterity as the poet, but who had just retired from the

office of Grand Pensionary of Holland, was appointed Ambassador; and, together with Schaep, former Resident in London, arrived in England in the latter part of December. The negotiations which ensued have now little interest. They were almost entirely limited to claims and counter claims, which were in reality foreign to the true business of the embassy. The relations between the two countries were such that amity and peace were for the time impossible. Commercial jealousy ran extremely high; injuries had been sustained on both sides; each held that its own claims were irrefragable; that those of the other were barely worth considering; and the discussion, such as it was, was still going on when a collision between the fleets rendered further negotiation useless.

The circumstances under which this collision occurred must remain doubtful, for the evidence as to matters of fact is conflicting. M. Lefèvre-Pontalis does not seem aware of this, and has accepted, without question, the statement made by the Dutch after many weeks' consideration. We prefer to rest our belief on a comparison of the statements made by the several officers concerned, English and Dutch, on the days immediately following the battle. But independently of this, it seems to be admitted that when the Dutch squadron was sent out for the protection of Dutch commerce, mention had been made of the salute claimed as a right, by the kings of England, from time immemorial; it was doubted whether the right should be admitted any longer, now that there was no king; and the matter was finally left to the discretion of Tromp, who had said that he paid the salute when the English had the superior force. But as the English claim, based originally on territorial possession, was absolute, this qualification of Tromp's was certain to bring on a contest if he met with an English squadron of inferior numbers; and without going into the question of which ship fired the first broadside—though the balance of the evidence against the 'Brederode' seems to us overpowering—or examining Tromp's after statement that he was on the point of saluting when the fight was unexpectedly forced on him; it is, at least, not disputed that through the afternoon of the day before (May 18–28) he lay with his fleet in Dover roads without saluting the fort; and that, in an insulting manner, he exercised his small-arm men at a mark, and in firing repeated volleys of musketry. This fact alone is sufficient to show Tromp's predisposition, and the events of the next day (May 19–29) were the necessary corollary. It

is indeed not improbable that Tromp, a partisan throughout of the House of Orange, was quite sensible of the injury he was inflicting on the policy of Holland, and that his action was dictated as much by party feeling as by national or professional jealousy.

At this time John de Witt first appeared in a prominent position in the States General. The correspondence with the ambassadors in England was entrusted to a commission, of which he, as Pensionary of Dordrecht, was president; and from this correspondence we learn how anxious he, personally, was that peace might be preserved; and he persuaded himself that his wishes were likely to be realised; as a lawyer he preferred argument to violence, and had, perhaps, not yet realised that at a certain stage an endless stream of unavailing discussion loses its charm to practical men. Even after the fight off Hythe, he was unwilling to believe in the failure of negotiation; and, whilst the partisans of the House of Orange and the English royalists were filled with rejoicing, he succeeded in inducing the States General to send Pauw, the Grand Pensionary of Holland, as a special ambassador. But meantime the Council of State, after a formal investigation, had decided that Tromp was the aggressor: from their point of view the Dutch had been continuing the negotiations as a treacherous mask. Without any investigation at all, the London mob came to the same conclusion, and would fain have torn old Cats and his colleagues to pieces, had not a strong guard been placed on their house. When Pauw arrived, the Parliament was in no humour for further discussion. A grievous injury had been inflicted on them; a Judas-blow had been aimed at England's maritime power; a large expense had been forced on them by the necessity of placing their navy on a war footing; and they were not now going to accept a mere apology, without substantial compensation and some guarantee on which they could depend. So the ambassadors returned to Holland without effecting anything, and the war was continued with equal energy and equal courage on both sides.

Tromp still held command of the Dutch fleet. His conduct at Dover had rendered him suspected by the Government; but he was unquestionably the ablest officer they had, and, as the war was to be, his politics were now of little moment. But a disastrous cruise in the North Sea, the scattering of his fleet, and the loss of many of his ships in a storm, excited the indignation of the war party. He had,

they said, neglected an opportunity of bringing Blake to action: Pauw had implored him not to fight except in self-defence: he had complied with Pauw's request: he was a traitor. They clamoured for his removal from the command; they stirred up the mob; and, amid uproar, riot, and confusion, Tromp was dismissed. His successor, Cornelis Witte de With, who, notwithstanding the similarity of name, was in no way related to the De Witts of Dordrecht, was a man of humble origin, and, like Tromp, a native of the Briel, who, by skill and courage, had won high naval rank. He was supposed to belong to the republican party; for which reason, and still more on account of his harsh temper and the severity of his discipline, he was hateful not only to the men, but even to the officers of the fleet. When the push came, in the battle by the Kentish Knock (October 8, 1652), several of the officers of high rank refused to fight under his command and drew off. De Ruyter and Evertsen, though personally hostile to the Admiral, waived their quarrel and fought stoutly; but many held aloof and left the English a victory which, by giving Blake, and others with him, a false impression of Dutch perseverance and courage, was shortly afterwards the occasion of his receiving a severe check, when the command was once more entrusted to Tromp.

Notwithstanding this partial success, however, gained off Dungeness, on December 10, the course of events ran strongly against the Dutch. The defeat off Portland, on February 28, followed three months later by that off Harwich, June 12-13, brought an embassy to England, which was ready to treat on the basis which the Council of State had laid down before the first hostilities—that, namely, of confederation. But the English now, and, as we have already pointed out, for the first time, insisted on a complete union of the two countries under one government; and, on this being declined, and no acceptable proposition offered in its stead, they permitted the Commissioners to depart, referring the issue to the God of battles. The crushing defeat off the Texel, on August 10, and the death of Tromp, brought the Dutch to a sense of the imminence of their danger. Every exertion was made for the defence of the country in this emergency. The extreme unpopularity of De With, and his failure the year before, rendered it unadvisable to appoint him again to the command of the fleet; whilst, at the same time, his high rank and distinguished reputation made it difficult to appoint a junior, such as Ruyter or Evertsen,

over his head. It may be also that there were doubts as to the party loyalty of these men; and thus, for reasons somewhat similar to those which in England had given the command of the fleet to soldiers like Blake, Deane, or Monck, a cavalry officer of noble birth and approved political principles, the Baron Obdam van Wassenaar, was appointed Lieutenant-Admiral of Holland; De With and Evertsen, Floriszoon and Ruyter, serving under him as vice-admirals. The satisfactory arrangement of this business—difficult on account of the many political and personal complications in which it was involved—was due almost entirely to John de Witt, who had just before (July, 1653) been definitely appointed Grand Pensionary of Holland,* which office he had provisionally held since the preceding summer during the absence of Pauw in England, and after his death, on February 21, 1653.

But more urgent even than the want of a commander-in-chief was the want of ships, of men, and of money. The Peace of Munster, now only five years old, had left Holland with a debt of more than 150,000,000 florins, paying interest at the rate of 5 per cent. De Witt was strongly averse to increasing this debt by any new loan; the money now wanted had therefore to be raised by voluntary contributions and by increased taxes. In this he succeeded so well that, for the whole expenses of this first war with England, only one loan of 800,000 florins had to be made, and that not till June, 1654, when the war was ended. The larger proportion of the necessary sums was raised by augmented duties on exports and imports; by a tax of 1 in 200 on all incomes exceeding 1,000 florins, and by a further tax, the amount of which is not stated, on capital. All the best ships of the East India Company were arrested for the State's service, and a considerable number were lent by Denmark. A liberal and punctual pay attracted seamen of all nations, many Scotch and Irish among them; and wealthy individuals subscribed large sums, in one instance for the pay and maintenance of 150 able seamen for six months.

By great exertions a powerful fleet was got together. It had scarcely put to sea (November, 1653), when it was dispersed by a violent storm; many of the ships were lost; others, shattered, disabled, dismasted, got back to the Texel

* This title is of French and English invention; the Dutch, of which it ought to be a translation, is Raadpensionaris, properly rendered in Latin by 'Consiliarius et Pensionarius.'

with difficulty. The hopes of the nation had been vain; the blockade had not been raised, and there was now no fleet to attempt it. With fishing and commerce, the revenue derived from them ceased. The Zuyder Zee was a forest of masts. Industry of all kinds was stopped. Grass grew in the streets of the towns: in Amsterdam there were not less than 1,500 houses to let. The country was filled with beggars. Confusion, discontent, disquietude increased daily. 'You may now, without doubt, have what conditions you will ask,' wrote to Thurloe one of his secret correspondents at the Hague. Abroad, Portugal took advantage of the opportunity to seize on the Dutch possessions in Brazil; and the King of Denmark repudiated the privileges granted him in 1651. Everything pointed to the same end, that, at any cost, peace must be concluded.

The negotiations which had been broken off in August, 1653, were renewed in November. The English Government, finding the repugnance of the States to a coalition or incorporation insuperable, demanded a full recognition of the English sovereignty of the sea; compensation for the injuries as scheduled by the English; and, as security for the future, the perpetual exclusion of the young prince from all powers civil or military. This last point the States General were most unwilling to yield. A very large party was still favourable to the hereditary claims of the House of Orange, even though they were to be held in abeyance during the prince's minority; whilst others objected to the interference of a foreign power in the internal affairs of the Republic. The strictly Orange party, led by the Count of Nassau and strengthened by the intrigues of the English royalists, was averse from a treaty with Cromwell on any terms; and Jongestall, one of the Commissioners in England, had been won over to their interests. It was concerning him that Beverningk, the chief commissioner, wrote on February 3, 1654:—

'The Protector has been very exactly informed, not only of his disaffection, but also of certain remarks which he has most imprudently let fall, and which have been repeated. It has been particularly reported to me that he has been heard to say, "In case the treaty should not be a success, the State has decided to declare war against the Protector personally, whilst offering its friendship to the English nation." This cannot but offend the Protector, and, from the bottom of my heart, I am sorry for it, seeing that the State has never had any such intention, and that it is entirely an invention of his own.'

This was only one, though an aggravated, instance of the

feeling against Cromwell. Libellous pamphlets were issued from the presses of Utrecht and other towns, which it was difficult to suppress, but which naturally tended to render Cromwell more inflexible. The principal object of the Commissioners, when all else was yielded, came to be the attainment of some concession on the demand for the exclusion of the Prince. But on this, as on all other points, Cromwell was firm: the only relaxation to which he would consent was that the exclusion might be guaranteed by the States of Holland instead of by the States General. To this they had to consent, and peace was finally proclaimed on May 6. 'To the United Provinces,' says M. Lefèvre-Pontalis, 'the only gain was the end of the war, whose continuance would have rendered the ruin of the republic inevitable.' It was said by all impartial judges that this danger was extreme; and Chanut, the French Ambassador at the Hague, who had first desired the continuance of the war and the consequent weakening of both belligerents, wrote on April 3, 1654:* 'The renewal of the war would so increase the strength of the English that nothing could resist them by sea. My opinion is, therefore, that our interests require peace. The evil is evidently so great that a respite is necessary if we wish this State to exist any longer.'

Notwithstanding the evident advantages of the peace to England, and the admitted necessity of it to the United Provinces, there was in both countries a certain outcry against the authors of it. It was, of course, the cue of the English royalists to find fault with whatever Cromwell did; and, on this occasion, to say that he had hastily patched up a peace, sacrificing the rights and interests of England, in order to have leisure to confirm his own despotic rule. And this has been repeated over and over again, without examination and probably without knowledge that the one advantage conceded to the Dutch was the permission to exist as an independent State. Cromwell was much too keensighted a politician not to see that the forcible incorporation of the United Provinces would be no gain to England; and though it did not appear in the negotiations, the war had told heavily on his own resources and treasury already exhausted by revolution and civil war. To conclude peace by compelling the enemy to accede to all his demands was as ad-

* M. Lefèvre-Pontalis gives this date as 1653, which must be wrong, unless Chanut was in the habit of writing nonsense.

vantageous to his internal administration as it was glorious to his foreign policy.

But John de Witt was equally the subject of hostile criticism. It was easy to say that he had sacrificed the interests of his country in order to win favour and support from Cromwell. It was even said that he himself was the real author of the exclusion clause; that he had suggested it to Cromwell, and had urged him to insist on the demand. Nor was what seemed very clear evidence wanting. De Witt's secretary, Johan van Messen, already discontented, was won over by one Ruyven, the treasurer of the Prince of Nassau, and not only systematically betrayed his master's confidential business, but falsified and forged documents tending to convict him both of this, and also of having further suggested the stringent blockade of the coasts of Zealand in order to compel that province to submit to the will of Holland. Fortunately for De Witt, the conspirators were men of business habits and kept a diary, in which they made note of the documents communicated to the Prince of Nassau; so that when, on suspicion of some malpractices, they were arrested and their papers seized (September, 1655), they stood convicted by their own hand. The States were, however, careful not to push the opposite faction too hard. Messen was declared infamous and banished for life; but Ruyven, the originator of the plot, who seemed the more guilty of the two, was banished for only six years; and the name of the Prince of Nassau who was, indeed, most probably innocent of the villany, was not even mentioned. In this milder judgement De Witt readily acquiesced, and a sort of understanding thus sprung up between him and the Prince, which led to a correspondence and an agreement, on the one side to favour the Prince's candidature for the rank of Field Marshal, vacant by the death of the lord of Brederode, and on the other to a formal acceptance of the exclusion clause.

The agreement between these two was the ratification of the disinheritation of the infant prince; as was said at the time, what had been painted only in water colour was now painted in oil. It did more than this: it broke up the Orange faction, disarmed part of it, rendered the other part for the time being powerless for opposition, and thus gave increased strength to the government, which day by day became more and more identified with the will and personal character of John de Witt. And his first care was the re-establishment of the finances of the State on a more satis-

factory basis, and a readjustment of the burdens which at that time pressed with undue weight on Holland. The abolition of privileges and exemptions, the revision of pensions and sinecures, and a severe economy in every department of the State's service accomplished a great deal. Still more important was the reduction of the interest on the Provincial Debt from 5 to 4 per cent., which, though not without strenuous opposition from several of the towns, was agreed to; two months' grace being granted for the convenience of those who were unwilling to accept the new rate: and to prevent the funds of Holland from coming into disrepute, the States General were prevailed on to make a similar reduction in the rate of interest on the Federal Debt; which of itself was of no great consequence. The money thus saved and economised, amounting in all to about two millions of florins per annum, was devoted to the successive reduction of the debt, which it was calculated might thus be paid off altogether in forty-one years.

Meantime, with the introduction of regularity and economy, with the re-establishment of commerce and trade, with the internal peace secured by the practical accession of the Prince of Nassau to the republican party, the Government at once assumed an unwonted strength, and though not without a struggle succeeded in remodelling the army, in which it enforced a more rigorous discipline, and in conciliating or restraining the clergy, whose extreme Calvinism revolted against the alliance with a latitudinarian like Cromwell, and against the spirit of toleration which refused to decree the expulsion of the Roman Catholic priests. In all this, the burden of the work, and the credit or the obloquy of it, fell on John de Witt. He it was, according to M. Lefèvre-Pontalis,

‘who had laid open to the States of Holland this course of prosperity, in which he guided them with as much firmness as foresight. Although charged only with the execution of their orders, he had succeeded in assuming such authority, that those whom he called “his masters” submitted themselves to his rule without difficulty or opposition. It was without flattery that the Ambassador Nieupoort wrote to him (August 20, 1655), “You who are so intimately acquainted with what “is going on in this State, you are best able to judge what ought or “ought not to be done, to which I and the rest of us have only to “conform ourselves.” And Chanut, the French Ambassador, wrote about the same time, “John de Witt is the most important personage “in the whole State, by reason of the power which Holland has over “the other Provinces, and of that which he has over the ten or twelve “chiefs of the governing party.”’

It was not only at home that De Witt succeeded in making the force of a united Government to be felt. In little less than three years from the time when, torn by faction and beaten down by a disastrous war, the republic had seemed, to friend and foes alike, on the verge of dissolution, the Dutch were in a position to interfere with authority and with the strong hand in the disputes of the northern kingdoms which threatened danger to their Baltic trade. It is unnecessary here to examine into the causes of the war which in 1655-7 was raging between Sweden and Poland, or into the changeful policy of the Elector of Brandenburg, which De Witt characterised as 'fox-like.' It is enough to say that the Swedish armies had overrun Poland, that Brandenburg had joined the invaders, and that in July 1656 the allies were threatening Dantzic, the granary of the United Provinces. It seemed time for them to interpose. On the motion of the States of Holland, the States General decided on supporting not so much Poland as their own interest. A fleet of forty-eight ships appeared off the port; a force of 1,300 men was thrown into the town, and the allies hastened to conclude a treaty by which the neutrality of Dantzic was secured.

The employment of the Swedish army in Poland seemed to the King of Denmark an opportunity for recovering former losses. In spite of the urgent representations of the States General and the remonstrances of the Grand Pensionary, he declared war in June, 1657, invaded Bremen, was beaten back, was driven into Copenhagen and there besieged by the King of Sweden at the head of 15,000 men. It appeared as if the last days of the Danish monarchy had arrived, the Baltic was on the point of becoming a Swedish lake, with the passage of the Sound subjected to a prohibitive toll. In the extremity of his need the King of Denmark implored the assistance of the States General, who determined that, at any price, the Sound must be kept open. A fleet of thirty-five ships under the command of Obdam was despatched to the relief of Copenhagen, which met the Swedish fleet under Marshal Wrangel, in the narrow passage between Kronborg and Helsingborg, on November 8, 1658. In these confined waters the ships, locked together, fought with the most sanguinary determination: the Dutch loss was severe; De With and Floriszoon, their vice-admirals, were slain; but the Swedes, when three of their ships had been captured and eight sunk, were compelled to retire, and the Dutch having the command of the sea, were able to reinforce the garrison of Copenhagen.

This rapid success kindled the jealousy of England and France. It was believed that they would intervene in favour of the Swedes. Sir George Ayscue had already been sent to aid them with his counsels, or to command their fleet in case of need. De Witt took the initiative, proposed a joint mediation, obtained an agreement to enforce peace on whichever of the belligerents should reject it, and virtually dictated the clauses of the treaty which left the Sound open to foreign ships of war. Even so, the difficulty was not at an end. The rival monarchs refused to accept the terms. The English admiral, Montagu, was more intent on the political crisis at home and withdrew his squadron. The Swedes then took a more decided tone and set the Dutch at defiance. De Ruyter, who had succeeded to the command, was ordered to renew hostilities. He immediately carried over a strong body of Danish and Dutch troops to Fyen, which was occupied by the Swedes, drove them back into Nyborg, and by a vigorous attack by land and sea compelled them to surrender at discretion, November 25, 1659. Three months later the King of Sweden died, and in the embarrassment of a minority, the ministers of his infant successor were anxious for peace, which despite the opposition of Denmark was finally concluded in June, 1660.

This was one of the culminating points of De Witt's administration. Everywhere the Dutch had been taking a leading part. They had pacified the north; they had joined with Cromwell in putting a stop to the cruel oppression of the Vaudois; they had checked and restrained the Barbary pirates, and in the far East they had negotiated a lucrative if not very dignified treaty with Japan. But now, the English restoration was big with the signs of coming trouble. The new king was not favourably disposed towards the Dutch republic; his personal recollections of the country were disagreeable; the States General had barely tolerated his presence when in exile; had declined his offers of serving in their fleet during the war; had refused to identify their cause with his in their struggle with Cromwell; and had not only made peace with the hated usurper, but had entered into close alliance with him, after having strengthened his position by accepting the exclusion clause, which struck directly at the king's sister's son. It was much to be feared that Charles would prove determinedly hostile; and from this point of view alone did John de Witt consider the Restoration. It was his earnest desire to maintain peace: for the rest, the English might please themselves. 'If the

devil,' he said, 'should be sovereign of Great Britain, it 'would be necessary to maintain a good understanding with 'him.'

Accordingly, as soon as the declaration of Parliament was known, the States General sent deputies to Charles, then at Breda, to compliment him and to invite him to the Hague, which he entered in state a few days later, May 25, 1660. The States General and the States of Holland offered their congratulations, and De Witt, as Grand Pensionary, addressed him in French, insisting that their alliance had been with England, not with Cromwell. Such an alliance, he said, was a necessity of their State, and had compelled them during these last years to do violence to their natural inclination; the king might judge, therefore, of the affection and zeal with which they would cherish and maintain the closest union and correspondence now that their natural inclination and the interest of the State were happily united. 'I quite 'understand,' replied Charles, 'that you have been forced to 'treat with these people who revolted against my father and 'have held out against me; henceforward you will have to 'do with men of honour;' that is to say, adds M. Lefèvre-Pontalis, men who by their duplicity gave the republic reason to regret the unyielding harshness of the Protector. The king afterwards attended a meeting of the States General, and on leaving gave the Grand Pensionary a paper in which he requested him to forward the interests of the princess, his sister, and the prince, his nephew, in such way as the princess might point out. De Witt, who, though he had not suggested, nor indeed favoured, the exclusion clause, was quite sensible of its value to his party, was much embarrassed by this pointed request; and finally answered it by courteous, almost obsequious generalities, which might mean everything, and in reality meant nothing.

When the king had departed, the effects of his interference were speedily manifest. The princess began to agitate for the appointment of her son to the post of Captain-General in anticipation. De Witt answered that such an appointment would be premature, but that he would endeavour to induce the States to constitute the prince a public ward and to undertake the charge of his education. The princess was not content with this, and pushed her demand, with a scarce concealed threat of appealing to the King of England or of exciting an insurrection of the Orange faction. Disunion was not long in showing itself. The States of Zealand granted the young prince the title of 'First Noble,' the many poli-

tical privileges of which were, however, to remain in abeyance till he should be eighteen; and they instructed their deputies in the States General to propose his appointment as Captain and Admiral-General, subject to the same restriction. A strong party was ready to support this; but there was a feeling that these offices and that of Stadtholder should not be held by the same person; and De Witt skilfully made use of this to persuade the most zealous partisans that they would gain much by waiting. The motion was, therefore, rejected; but the States of Holland by a unanimous vote charged themselves with the education of the prince, and revoked the Act of Exclusion, declaring that they had consented to it only to satisfy the demands of Cromwell.

By these measures De Witt succeeded in winning the esteem of the princess, who was now willing to wait, in the belief that, when the time came, he would be ready to support the prince's claims. Unfortunately, during a visit to England some months later, she was attacked by small-pox, died after a few days' illness, on December 24, 1660, and by her will besought her brother to act as a father to her son. Charles accepted the charge, and appointed a commission to watch over the education of his nephew in concert with that already appointed by the States of Holland. This double guardianship was still further complicated by the claims put forward by the princess dowager to have the control of her grandson's education; and disputes and confusion were the necessary consequence. 'Tis pitiable to see,' wrote John de Witt on March 4, 1661, 'how they are trying, in all sorts of ways, to render useless the resolution of the States in respect of the prince's education, and to disgust both the States and their commissioners, who, nevertheless, have the best intentions for the service and advancement of his Highness.'

It is unnecessary to follow in detail the relations of the two countries during the years immediately succeeding. The personal dislike of Charles, and the entanglements arising from the affairs of the Prince of Orange, were sufficient to embitter any political or commercial dispute; and with a trade extending over the whole mercantile world, and with pushing, if not grasping merchants, in an age when rights and wrongs were but loosely defined, it could not but be that disputes would arise. There were beyond doubt causes of just complaint on both sides, but none that might not have been amenable to diplomacy and have admitted a peaceful

solution, had not personal motives stood in the way. Charles disliked the Dutch, and he was in want of money; he conceived that a war might put some into his hands; that of the sums voted by Parliament, some might be applied to other purposes; and he was able, by making the quarrel appear to turn on rights of trade, to give it a short-lived popularity.

The rest is a familiar though painful story. Without any declaration or any known cause of war, the Dutch settlements on the west coast of Africa were seized by Sir Robert Holmes, in what M. Lefèvre-Pontalis has properly stigmatised as '*une véritable expédition de pirates.*' And the war, thus begun in piracy, and conducted, during the two following years, without energy, intelligence, or skill, ended in shame and disgrace, when the king, having lavished on the ministers of his personal vices the money which had been voted for the maintenance of the fleet, was unable to find ships or men to defend the approaches of London, when the Thames was blocked up, the shipping in the Medway burnt, and the south coast of England insulted with impunity. Fortunately for England, peace was an immediate necessity of De Witt's position. The war had been forced on him sorely against his will; and though, being in it, he had borne it in the manner recommended by Polonius, the vigour of his action had itself been prompted by the necessity of curtailing both the struggle and the negotiations. There was no time to be captious. The question of the salute at sea was left as it had been decided by Cromwell; but several matters of commercial dispute, which had more than a sentimental value, were settled in favour of the Dutch. De Witt was content with the substance, and justly prided himself on having obtained conditions which he could never before have ventured to demand. He might probably have been more exacting; but he was alarmed by the conduct and suspicious of the designs of the King of France; he must be at liberty to oppose himself to them, and peace with England was the first step.

Louis XIV. was indeed now, after the death of Philip IV., preparing to maintain wholly or in part those claims on the Spanish succession which he had formally relinquished by the Treaty of the Pyrenees, only seven years before. If nothing further could be gained, even the Rhine boundary would be something, and he would begin by occupying Flanders, Franche-Comté, and Luxembourg. The design was a gross outrage on international morality; but, aided by

a body of ministers and diplomatists trained in the school of Mazarin, he was able to make his advances with a skill almost equal to his perfidy. With the exception of Spain itself, the powers most interested in thwarting his designs on Flanders were the United Provinces and England, the latter of which, by the possession of Dunkirk, had ready access to the country, and could at any time threaten his communications. Hence the peculiar importance of the sale of that fortress.

The war between England and the United Provinces was another triumph to French diplomatic skill. Had Charles not been assured of French neutrality, he would probably have nursed his wrath without overt action; had De Witt not been assured of French assistance, he might probably have been more yielding, even in the face of insolence and aggression; but Louis had permitted both to feel the assurance necessary to stimulate them to war, and to waste their energies in mutual destruction. The promises of neutrality and support were alike falsified, or adhered to just so far as was necessary to make the naval war more severe; but though the Dutch were led to expect that they would be joined by the French fleet, under the Duc de Beaufort, the years passed by without the French ships once appearing in the North Sea. It was enough for Louis that the two nations, whose opposition might have been embarrassing to him, were in the throes of deadly combat, and that the Dutch fleet had already sailed to burn the shipping at Chatham.

In the end of May, 1667, he entered the Low Countries at the head of an army 50,000 strong, and commanded by Turenne. Opposition worthy of the name there was none; and within a couple of weeks the border fortresses had all fallen into his hands. Lille held out better; but the skill of Vauban, seconded by the cowardice or treachery of the citizens, speedily reduced the garrison to surrender, and the whole country lay open to the invaders. The United Provinces were not slow to recognise the extremity of their danger. If Antwerp should become French—as seemed not unlikely—the navigation of the Scheldt would assuredly be closed to them, to the irreparable damage of their commerce. ‘If the French shall carry Flanders,’ wrote Sir William Temple on October 10, 1667,* ‘as they very well may in

* M. Lefèvre-Pontalis, quoting this letter, dates it December 10, 1668, which, on the very face of it, is erroneous, and is corrected by a reference to Sir W. Temple’s Works (4 vols. 8vo., 1814), vol. i. p. 291.

'another campaign, the Dutch are sensible that they must 'fall to be a maritime province of France;' if, indeed, they were not actually annexed, as part of the empire of Charles V., whose heir Louis claimed to be. And meantime he utterly scouted the idea of being in any way responsible to the Dutch for what it now pleased him to do. He put negotiation or explanation entirely on one side, and arrogantly notified to the States General his resolution to unite the Low Countries to his kingdom.

It was in this terrible strait that the Dutch were placed whilst the negotiations at Breda were going on, and when they struck that last severe blow at England in June, 1667. But notwithstanding the personal feelings of Charles, the interests of the two countries were for the time being so manifestly one, and so sensible of this were the Commissioners, that the treaty was hastily concluded, and within a few months, another treaty of intimate alliance was signed. This was the crowning glory in the career of both Temple and De Witt. In England, as well as in the United Provinces, the advance of the French had given much uneasiness. Even in the mind of Charles there was a perception that he had been made a cat's-paw of; but it was difficult to induce him to take any strong measures against Louis, who now offered to assist him in seizing the Spanish possessions in the West Indies. He was thus, in December 1667, proposing to the States an alliance with the avowed purpose of compelling France to disgorge her recent conquests, and was negotiating with France the terms of an alliance, defensive and offensive, against Spain or any other country.

De Witt could not possibly fathom the abysses of Charles's duplicity, but he would seem to have had an instinctive consciousness of it, and was unwilling to commit the States to any resolution or act of hostility against France till he was sure of his ground. It was eventually the unmistakable expression of public feeling in England which directed the course of events. The people, at any rate, were indignant at the part which, it began to be clear, England had been made to play for the benefit of France, and were resolved on aiding the United Provinces to check the designs of Louis. Early in January, 1668, Temple was directed to enter into an arrangement with De Witt. Probably it was the intention of the Court to prolong the negotiations, giving time for a change in popular opinion, or for new offers from France; but by the tact and promptitude of

Temple, and by the readiness of resource which De Witt exhibited when he found himself in accord with a man at once keen and honest, the business was hurried on, and the treaty of 'mutual defence and alliance' was concluded on January 23, within three weeks of Temple's being first summoned to England to confer with the King's ministers, and actually in five days of discussion with De Witt and his colleagues: a despatch which, as De Witt told Temple, when congratulating him on the end attained, no other minister had ever been able to approach, and which was 'directly against the nature of their constitutions, which 'enjoined them recourse to their Provinces upon all such 'occasions, and used to draw out all common deliberations 'to months' delays.'

The provisions of the treaty were explicit enough, binding the two Powers to use all possible means—force, if necessary—to induce the Most Christian King to make peace on condition of retaining his recent conquests. The clauses relating to this armed intervention were, however, kept secret, out of respect for the susceptibilities of the King of France, and partly, it may be, out of suspicion of the good faith of the English; for, even whilst accepting the treaty, De Witt had stated that the great difficulty in the way of an alliance with England was that 'unsteadiness of counsels which 'seemed a fatal thing to her constitution; her conduct was 'subject to a perpetual fluctuation, so that it was impossible 'to calculate on it for two years on end.' The chance of Count Dohna, the Swedish ambassador at the Hague, being a native of Holland, a nephew of the Princess Dowager, and having a family quarrel with the King of France, led to a remarkable and unhopd-for extension of the treaty. The idea would seem to have originated in a conversation between Temple and De Witt. Temple undertook to call on Dohna and sound him as to his inclinations. This he did, and to such good purpose that, when the treaty was signed, Sweden was also provisionally admitted as a party to it.*

The King of France was meantime pushing his conquests in Franche-Comté. That province was no more capable of withstanding his armies than Flanders had been. Want

* In estimating the value of this accession, it must be borne in mind that the Sweden of the seventeenth century was widely different from the Sweden which we now know. Amongst other continental territories, it held Bremen, which gave it an important position on the North Sea, and entitled it to rank as a Western maritime Power.

of preparation, gross incapacity, treason, and corruption, hastened to yield up post after post, as fast as the French troops drew near. 'The receiving such a conquest,' said the Spaniards, 'was work fitting for his lacqueys rather than for a great king.' A fortnight sufficed to give France a new province. 'What has happened,' wrote the French minister, Lionne, to D'Estrades, the ambassador at the Hague, on February 24, 'confounds the imagination.'

Suddenly the king was aware of the Triple Alliance. In all history, the event which this can best be compared to is the sudden stop of Massena in his conquering march through Portugal, in face of the lines of Torres Vedras. There the obstacle was military and material; here it was diplomatic and moral; but the surprise and the thoroughness of the check were equal. 'There is no secrecy,' says Bacon, 'comparable to celerity,' and the extraordinary despatch with which this treaty had been concluded had completely baffled D'Estrades. The ambassador had indeed heard of proposals having passed, but some slighting remarks by De Witt had completely lulled his suspicion. 'It would all end in smoke,' he said; 'the king his master might laugh at the whole thing:' and on the very eve of the signing he had answered some one who warned him of what was going on, 'Six weeks hence we may speak of it.' He was proportionally disconcerted when Temple communicated the treaty to him; even though nothing in it could be considered as adverse to France, and though De Witt assured him that 'if they perceived that England unduly favoured Spain, Holland would at once break with her, valuing the friendship of the king before everything.' De Witt did indeed hope that the king would accept the mediation, which was what the open clauses of the treaty amounted to; that the secret clauses would thus not come into force, and that Louis would be neither annoyed nor provoked.

It was, however, not long before the French were acquainted with the existence of the secret clauses; and though D'Estrades, at the Hague, could find out nothing concerning them, De Ruvigny, the ambassador in London, had better success; notwithstanding the commercial spirit of the Dutch, money had, it would seem, a more extended social circulation in England. Before February was over the French king was fully informed of the whole treaty, and particularly of that clause which threatened him with force. It was, indeed, represented to him by D'Estrades, eager to minimise his failure, by Turenne, by Condé, that the parties to the league

were quite unprepared for immediate action, and that the war might be terminated before they could collect their forces or be ready to take the field. Franche-Comté had already been occupied, and the conquest might be completed without difficulty. On the other hand, De Witt was profuse in apologies for interfering: his desire to turn away the king's wrath seemed excessive to Temple, and must have seemed silly to Lionne. 'Pray tell M. de Witt,' wrote the latter to D'Estrades on March 9, 'that if I could only have 'two hours' conversation with him I would answer for the 'peace, for I know how fertile he is in expedients.' But Temple wrote to him on March 25:—

'I think that by all our negotiations, by all our good offices and caresses, we shall never obtain a peace from France while they have any appearances of pursuing their interest or their glory in carrying on the war; and that the only way of disposing them to a peace . . . is by showing them the strength of our forces and the firmness of our resolutions . . . and by letting the Most Christian King know . . . that upon the first advances he shall make to attack the rest of Flanders, we will march with our forces to defend it, and will endeavour in all ways to make a diversion both by sea and by land.'

Nevertheless, every effort was made to spare the pride of the king and to enable him to draw back with dignity; and thus, after a keen contest, the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle was signed on May 12.

'This peace,' says M. Lefèvre-Pontalis, 'which saved Spain in spite of herself, was still advantageous to France. It assured to Louis important acquisitions which advanced the frontiers of his kingdom, and began the dismemberment of the Low Countries. At the same time it seemed to give Europe a pledge of his moderation, which he might avail himself of to boast that it was only his desire for peace that had disarmed him. None the less, it was the Triple Alliance which had compelled him, as a measure of prudence, to halt in his career of conquest; and, finding himself threatened by a European coalition, he acted with wise policy in declining to brave it. . . . The Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, bringing the difficult negotiations to a satisfactory conclusion, gave the States the benefit of the Triple Alliance, and crowned the glory which they had won by imposing the Treaty of Breda on England. Henceforward they might consider themselves the arbiters of Europe; and they gave themselves up, with a somewhat rash pride, to the contemplation of their diplomatic victory, for which they were destined to pay dearly a few years later.'

For indeed the position of the United Provinces, however honourable, was big with danger. De Witt quite well understood that the hostility of Louis, once awakened, was likely to prove a more permanent thing than the friendship

of Charles, and that the policy of France could be better calculated on than that of England; but even he had probably not realised how little dependence was to be placed on the promises and pledges of the English King. Some French writers of the day gave Charles credit for an astuteness of villainy to which he was not entitled, and supposed that his sole object in entering upon the Triple Alliance was to detach the United Provinces from France and lay them open to a renewed attack. We think that this was a misconception; we think that he became a party to the league solely by reason of the pressure of public opinion and of the promptitude with which Temple acted on his instructions. But his dislike of the Dutch was a deep personal feeling, and he was anxious to get rid of his engagements to them as soon as possible. Common report has thrown the odium of the dissolution of the alliance on the Cabal, but we are ready to believe that the moving spirit in the measure was the King himself, who was actuated by a concurrence of the passions which had greatest weight with him—hatred, avarice, and lust. With these dispositions, causes of complaint were not likely to be wanting. Commercial disputes, the salute of the flag, medals or pictures celebrating the victories of which the Dutch were justly proud, the exhibition, as a trophy, of the ‘Royal Charles’ which had been carried off from Chatham, the publication of a book bearing the title of ‘Belgium gloriosum,’ were all alleged by the English ministers as grievances or insults. In vain did the Dutch ambassador attempt to smooth away the difficulties; he was told that if the States General wished to please the king, they should begin by the payment of a subsidy. ‘We will rather,’ answered De Witt, ‘keep the money for our ships and our soldiers,’ and he refused to entertain a proposal to cede the Briel and Flushing.

The negotiations which occupied the next three years have little political interest, for the issue, depending on the anger of Louis, was a foregone conclusion. His wrath was only limited by his power: he was determined to revenge himself on the United Provinces; and, to prevent any renewal of the Triple Alliance, he resolved for the present to waive his pretensions to the Spanish Low Countries. Spain, however, refused to be cajoled, and the geographical position of Flanders rendered even her neutrality of value to the States. But it was of most importance to them that they should be able to defend themselves, and this they neither were nor could be in the present form of their constitution.

M. Lefèvre-Pontalis thus describes their military condition :—

‘ Their wealth, the envy of all other countries, their vast commerce, and their fleets, powerful at sea, were quite unable to shield them from invasion by land. The troops necessary for this were altogether wanting; and yet, far from feeling uneasy on this score, the States of Holland, ever since the attempt against their power made by William II., had sought their safety in the weakness of the army, which they considered dangerous to their liberty. The old army of the War of Independence, illustrious by so many battles and sieges, had, for the last twenty-five years, had no enemy to contend with, and had been quickly disorganised; and the imprudent confidence which the Triple Alliance gave the States General had rendered them careless of the maintenance of a military force. The Grand Pensionary shared this same deceptive security, though, even had he wished to do so, he might have found it difficult to check the course of public opinion, which required the disbandment of a part of the army in order to reduce the burden of its cost.’

It was not only that the official numbers were very small; these numbers were much larger than that of the men mustered; and the men, few as they were, were not exercised, were undisciplined, were insufficiently armed. Of the fortifications, many had fallen into ruin or been dismantled; in others, ‘ the bastions had been turned into gardens, the ditches partly filled up, houses built round the ramparts, and the interests of defence had been sacrificed to the convenience and pleasure of the governors of the towns.’

When, therefore, in May 1672, the storm of war burst on the unhappy country, it found it virtually undefended. By sea the nation was as strong as before; the navy had been maintained, new ships had been added, De Ruyter was in command, and the battle of Solebay was as creditable to him as it was the reverse to the commanders-in-chief of the allies, both English and French, who, with a superior force, permitted themselves to be caught at a disadvantage on a lee shore, from which they only escaped, the English with the loss of many stout ships and brave men, the French with the loss of credit if not of honour. But on shore the country was overrun without difficulty. The towns seemed to vie with each other as to which could surrender most promptly. The panic was general. Amsterdam was saved only by opening the sluices, cutting the dykes, and flooding the land. For the moment the progress of the invasion was checked; time was gained; and in such a crisis time was everything.

But meantime the fury of the people began to take definite

form. They were panic-struck and mad. They saw the effects of the government, of which De Witt had been for long the representative. They remembered how, with less force and less wealth, they had won their independence under the command of princes of the House of Orange; and on De Witt's shoulders they laid the blame of their present downfall. To a great extent they were right. De Witt had, indeed, little part in the revolution of twenty-two years before—the revolution which had gone so far towards disintegrating the republic; but his tact, courage, and dominating intellect had speedily asserted itself; and for a period of nineteen years he had been the master rather than, as his title imported, the paid adviser of the States of Holland, without whose guidance and resolution they would long since have reverted to their allegiance. Even within the last few months, when the imminence of the danger had rendered the appointment of a Captain-General necessary, he had struggled hard to limit the authority and privileges which would naturally accompany the title.

But now the wave of public opinion with irresistible force carried the Prince of Orange to power. Had he been older, had the times been more quiet, the revolution might have been as peaceful as that which had consigned him to a childhood of comparative obscurity; and De Witt might have been conciliated or banished, or executed with legal forms, as his predecessor Barneveld had been. That from an Orange point of view, De Witt was marked out for death, is certain; and there was no want of men willing both to sentence him and to carry the sentence into execution. At midnight, on June 21, a party of these, all men of respectable family, attacked him in the street and, having despatched him, left him for dead. One of the would-be assassins was arrested, tried, convicted, and executed within eight days; the others found shelter in the camp of the prince, who refused to give them up. A similar but unsuccessful attempt was, about the same time, made against Cornelis de Witt in Dordrecht. Meantime in every town were uproar and revolt. Orange up, white (or, in Dutch, *Wit*) down, were the Orange colours, and became the rallying cry of the insurgents. At Dordrecht the prince was received with the utmost enthusiasm. Cornelis de Witt, alone of the counsellors of the town, refused to sign the decree pronouncing for the re-establishment of the *Stadtholdership*; and when at last he yielded to the entreaties of his wife, he added to his name the letters V.C., which he

explained to mean *Vi Coactus*. His opposition could but serve to concentrate on him the hatred of the Orange party, which then included the whole nation, and the ill-will of the Prince, who, a few days afterwards (July 4) was elected Stadtholder, Captain, and Admiral-General of Holland, under the name and style of William III. The people were wild with delight, and it is quite certain that if the new Stadtholder had chosen, he might have allayed the storm which was raging in every town in Holland; might—had he seen fit so to do—have banished the brothers De Witt; and have, at any rate, kept his name clear of the foul stain which their terrible fate has left on it.

It is unnecessary here to repeat the story of the death of John and Cornelis de Witt, which is familiar to every school-boy through the pages of Dumas, who, whilst inventing the history with his usual recklessness, has not added to the brutality of the massacre, since exaggeration was impossible. It is enough, then, to say, that in a wild outburst of popular fury, unrestrained either by the States, the municipal authorities, or the prince, the two brothers were forcibly led out of prison, knocked down, stabbed, hacked, cut and torn into a thousand pieces; and that the murderers, who were guilty of the most revolting excesses, who washed their hands in the blood, and struggled with each other for mouthfuls of the flesh, were, for the most part, men of respectable position. It is said that Cornelis Tromp, disguised in a mantle, looked on and approved: that may be a slander, based on his known hatred of the brothers; but it is quite certain that the men most conspicuous in the fearful throng were well-to-do shopkeepers, officers or soldiers in the municipal companies. It is this which gives the peculiar horror to the tragical end of John and Cornelis de Witt: men whose pure and upright character ought to have won for them the respect even of their adversaries, the sympathy even of their conqueror. That they failed in the cause to which they devoted their lives, the establishing the political predominance of Holland in a united and consolidated republic, was due to the constitutional difficulties and provincial jealousies, which could only be overcome by more drastic measures than were at the service of a Grand Pensionary; but, notwithstanding this, it will still be remembered that John de Witt was the virtual ruler of the nation during the time of its greatest power and most resplendent glory.

- ART. VI.—1. *Histoire des Animaux d'Aristote*. Traduite en Français et accompagnée de Notes perpétuelles. Par J. BARTHÉLEMY-SAINT-HILAIRE, Membre de l'Institut, Sénateur. Three vols. 8vo. Paris: 1883.
2. *Aristotle: A Chapter from the History of Science, including Analyses of Aristotle's Scientific Writings*. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. London: 1864.
3. *Aristotelis de Animalibus Historiæ Libri X*. Textum recensuit Jul. Cæs. Scaligeri versionem diligenter recognovit F. G. SCHNEIDER. Lipsiæ: 1811.

OF all the great intellects that have added lustre to the world of thought and philosophy, the name of Aristotle stands prominently forth; so comprehensive and piercing a genius, such indefatigable zeal and untiring industry could not fail to be productive of great results; for twenty centuries his name and authority held the whole civilised world in awe. What are Aristotle's merits as a teacher of biology, and what is the real value of his scientific writings? Widely different opinions have been held. On the one hand, the late Mr. G. H. Lewes says:—

'It is difficult to speak of Aristotle without exaggeration—he is felt to be so mighty, and is known to be so wrong. History, surveying the whole scope of his pretensions, gazes on him with wonder. Science, challenging these separate pretensions and testing their results, regards them with indifference—an indifference only exasperated into antagonism by the clamorous urgency of unauthenticated praise. It is difficult to direct the opposing streams of criticism into the broad equable current of a calm appreciation, because the splendour of his fame perpetuates the memory of his failure, and to be just we must appreciate both. His intellect was piercing and comprehensive; his attainments surpassed those of every known philosopher; his influence has only been exceeded by the great founders of religions. Nevertheless, if we now estimate the product of his labours in the discovery of positive truths, it appears insignificant when not erroneous. None of the great germinal discoveries in science are due to him or to his disciples.'

On the other hand, the learned French translator of Aristotle's works, M. Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire, after lamenting the loss of many of Aristotle's works, remarks:—

'Opposite a monument so beautiful, so colossal, there is still astonishment such as was felt by Cuvier. Three centuries and a half before the Christian era there is the science of nature, and especially the science of animals. There are all at once the three sciences, zoo-

logy, physiology, and anatomy, created with their fundamental principles, their method, their elementary classifications, framework, and principal details! There they are, created in such a way that they seem at first without precedent, and that they remain for more than twenty centuries without receiving the slightest increase! Zoology, properly so called, physiology, and comparative anatomy, have remained even to us very nearly such as Aristotle has constituted them; and if in our days they have made immense progress, it is by remaining faithful to the way which he has pointed out for them.' (Preface, pp. lii., liii.)

M. Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire thus seems to endorse all that Buffon, Cuvier, and others have written in praise of Aristotle's works on natural history. Let us briefly notice the language of these two great French zoologists:—

'Aristotle's *History of Animals*,' says Buffon, 'is perhaps even now the best work of its kind; he probably knew animals better, and under more general views than we do now. Although the moderns have added their discoveries to those of the ancients, I do not believe that we have many works on natural history that we can place above those of Aristotle and Pliny.'

Again, in speaking of Aristotle's plan, in which he takes Man as a model, and compares the difference between the parts of man and those of other animals, Buffon says, 'he accumulates facts, and does not write one useless word.'

The laudatory language of the illustrious Cuvier is equally strong, and, indeed, as M. Saint-Hilaire says, is manifested by more animated expressions. 'Of all the sciences, that which owes the most to Aristotle is the natural history of animals. Not only did he know a great number of species, but he studied and described them after a vast and luminous plan which, perhaps, none of his successors have approached.' Again, 'the principal divisions still followed by naturalists in the animal kingdom are due to Aristotle, and he indicated several to which they have returned in these later times, after having unfortunately diverged from them.' 'Everywhere Aristotle observes facts with attention.' Speaking of the '*History of Animals*,' Cuvier writes: 'I cannot read this book without being ravished with astonishment. Indeed, it is impossible to conceive how a single man was able to collect and compare the multitude of particular facts implied in the numerous general rules and aphorisms contained in this work, and of which his predecessors never had any idea.' But it is, above all, says M. Saint-Hilaire, in his '*Lectures on the*

'History of the Natural Sciences' in the College of France, at the close of his life, that Cuvier shows himself a passionate admirer of the Greek naturalist.

'We cannot reproduce the exact expressions which the incomparable professor uses, since his lectures were not corrected by his hand; but if they have not preserved the form of his style, they give at least his thought, and they preserve a faithful trace of the most ardent and deliberate enthusiasm. In his eyes "Aristotle is the giant of Greek science; before Aristotle, science did not exist; he created it from fragments. One cannot read his 'History of Animals' without being delighted with astonishment. His zoological classification leaves few things to be done by the ages which have come after him. His work "is one of the greatest monuments that the genius of man has raised to "natural science."'

These reiterated praises are regarded by his recent French translator as decisive. On the other hand, the language of Cuvier, in the opinion of the late lamented English scholar and physiologist, George Henry Lewes, 'passes all bounds permissible to sincere enthusiasm; the more so because of the authority attached to his own eminent name. Others speak with a like exaggeration, but not with a like authority.'

M. Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire, in his interesting preface to his translation of the 'History of Animals,' quotes the opinions of other naturalists of note, who express themselves more or less strongly in praise of Aristotle's scientific works, such as Isidore Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, Flourens, Littré, Milne-Edwards, C. Claus, Victor Carus, &c., and then proceeds to consider the opinion expressed by Mr. G. H. Lewes, as a critic who is unable to follow in the rear of the enthusiastic panegyrists of the Greek philosopher.

To what extent Aristotle's admirers are justified in the unqualified praises they have so enthusiastically bestowed on his natural history writings will be seen by and by, when we bring before our readers some of his own statements concerning various animals or physiological questions which he discusses. The subject does not concern itself with Aristotle's splendid and, perhaps, unrivalled genius, his logical power of thought, his comprehensive and penetrating mind, his love of truth, his appreciation of a true method, his clear intellect and his extraordinary diligence; it has nothing to do with the great relative value of his scientific writings, considered at the time in which he lived; all unprejudiced students of zoology, whether of the past or the present, are willing to do glad homage to the 'Father

'of Natural History,' and delight to read the numerous admirable and correct accounts of the animals of which he treats; they will recognise in his treatise 'On the Parts of Animals,' its great value and interest in the history of science, both on account of the materials it furnishes, and because it is one of the earliest attempts to found biology on comparative anatomy; they will admit his treatise 'On the Generation and Development of Animals' to be his masterpiece in science, will recognise its true greatness, and 'be surprised and delighted to find how often Aristotle seems at the highest level of speculation, even when they compare his statements with the results of the most advanced embryologists.' The question does not concern itself with these points: it has reference to the claim made by Aristotle's too ardent panegyrists, that he discovered a system so perfect as to leave to us little if any thing to alter; that in several instances he anticipated modern discoveries, and that his descriptions are marvels of accuracy and research. How far such statements are true must be discovered by the simple test of reading Aristotle's own words: we must verify; we must see what he has actually written; we are not compelled to follow Cuvier, still less Buffon. The enquirer will think of the well-known line,

'Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri,'

and will form an independent judgement; he will refuse to follow blindly any master, even though he be a Cuvier. He will bear in mind the words of a learned English physician and author of the seventeenth century: 'The mortallest enemy unto knowledge, and that which hath done the greatest execution upon truth, hath been a peremptory adhesion unto authority; and more especially, the establishing of our belief upon the dictates of antiquity.*' To the task of a searching enquiry Mr. G. H. Lewes applied himself about twenty years ago, and, although some persons may think that he has been in some cases too severe upon Aristotle, we consider that, on the whole, his criticism is just, and that he has amply proved his case, not against the philosopher himself, but against his exaggerating eulogists. He has properly placed Aristotle on a lower, yet still an exalted position on the pinnacle of zoological fame.

'Aristotle's zoological classification leaves few things to be done by the ages which have come after him.' This is

* Sir Thomas Browne's Works, i. p. 39, ed. Bohn.

Cuvier's statement. Had Aristotle any idea of forming a systematic classification of any kind? On this question there is great difference of opinion. Some think that Aristotle purposely abstained from forming any system; but had merely a vague general idea of classification, which as little resembled a system as a mere jotting down of all the letters of the alphabet would resemble an essay; others discover a system in it so perfect as to leave nothing scarcely to alter.* There is no doubt that Aristotle had certain wide and indefinite views of classification, to borrow the words of Whewell, which, though not very exact, are still highly creditable to him. The honour due to the stupendous accumulation of zoological knowledge which Aristotle's works contain cannot be tarnished by our denying him the credit of a system which he never dreamt of, and which from the nature of the progress of science could not possibly be constructed at that period. 'Classification is one of the latest results of scientific research.' It is true that Aristotle has exemplified groups of animals which agree with many of the modern classes, orders, and genera, but their relative value is not so defined. His nine books in the 'History of Animals' enumerate the differences of animals in almost all conceivable respects: the organs of sense, of motion, of nutrition, the interior anatomy, the exterior covering, the manner of life, growth, generation, and many other circumstances; but Aristotle appears to have had no appreciation of the law of the subordination of characters; the same denomination, viz. γένος, genus, is applied by him to each of his groups, though in some cases he distinguishes the greater from the less. Agassiz says, 'Aristotle cannot be said to have proposed any regular classification. He speaks constantly of more or less extensive groups under a common appellation, evidently considering them as natural divisions, but he nowhere expresses a conviction that these groups may be arranged methodically so as to exhibit the natural affinities of animals.'

The aim of classification, as Mr. G. H. Lewes remarks, is to group animals in such a manner that each class and genus shall indicate the degree of complexity attained by the organism, and thus the external form betray the internal structure; but no such scheme ever entered the head of Aristotle; he only wished to mark out the obviously distinctive charac-

* See Kùlb : Aristoteles Thiergeschichte, in zehn Büchern, übersetzt und erläutert von Dr. Ph. H. Kùlb. Stuttgart, 1856.

ters by which the common eye could recognise each class or genus. Men had before him 'spontaneously grouped animals 'as four-footed, winged, aquatic, terrestrial, oviparous, &c.,' and had, in vague general terms, thus grouped together animals under these respective heads. We may call this, if we will, a rude sketch of a classificatory system. Moreover there are certain indications in his writings that Aristotle more or less adopted the system then in use; not unfrequently he mentions certain families or groups which he says are 'without a name,' 'have never received a name,' and it is noticeable that he never proposes names for these anonymous groups, which we should expect he would have done had he intended the formation of a grand philosophical system of classification. He uses only two formal terms of classification, *γένος* and *εἶδος*; the former denoting an assemblage of different animals which have some general resemblance to each other: it may be equivalent to the modern terms *family*, *order*, or *class*; the latter generally is applied to what we understand by *species*.

M. Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire's remarks on Aristotle's classification are, on the whole, very just indeed:—

'The feeble side of Aristotle's zoology,' he says, 'is the classification. The author never explained it in a systematic manner, and it would be rather hazardous to seek to extract it from the works through which it is dispersed. However, Aristotle did not confound all the species in a common disorder; between them he positively indicated classes, although these classes are too few and indistinct. The principal are those of animals which have blood, and those which have not any; those of the vivipara, ovipara, vermipara; those of the quadrupeds, the birds, the reptiles, cetacea, fish, insects; and, lastly, those of the molluscs, crustacea, testacea, and the zoophytes. That is not, one must confess, a classification in the rigorous sense of the word; but if one thinks of the difficulties presented, even in our time, by classification, one will be inclined to indulgence, and excuse in Aristotle a defect which is compensated for by so many other merits. A regular arrangement of all animated beings was impossible at the time in which he wrote, whatever may have been his genius. There was necessarily a multiplicity of observations of detail which time only could accumulate, and even to-day the materials are not yet sufficient. But however incomplete Aristotle's classification may be, it ought always to figure in science-history, because it is the first in date and encloses the principal elements of all those which have followed. It comes immediately before the classifications of Linnæus and Cuvier, as the historians of zoology have well seen.' (Preface, p. cxvii.)

From the above extract, it will be seen how widely and how justly Aristotle's French translator differs from Cuvier, who

states that 'Aristotle's zoological classification leaves few things to be done by the ages which have come after him.'

Let us now enquire how far Cuvier's other statement that 'everywhere Aristotle observes facts with attention,' is true. 'Cuvier, already in all his glory,' says M. Saint-Hilaire, 'does not hesitate to say that the history of the elephant is more exact in Aristotle than in Buffon, and in speaking of the camel he praises Aristotle for having perfectly described and characterised the two species.' We have not an edition of Buffon at hand to which to refer, but if Aristotle's account of the elephant is more correct than that of Buffon, we are sorry for Buffon. Aristotle speaks many things correctly of the elephant, but some very incorrectly, and it is quite a question whether he ever saw this animal in his life; be this as it may, he affirms that it has no nails on its toes, though he correctly refers to the toes which are scarcely distinguished. The nails of the elephant are one of the 'points' which the natives of India always regarded as one of the marks of a well-bred animal, and are nearly always conspicuous. M. Saint-Hilaire tells us in a note on this passage* that Camus and MM. Aubert and Wimmer consider this passage an interpolation. Let us take another point: the 'grey-headed error' that the elephant has no joints. Aristotle says 'the elephant is not so constructed as to be unable to sit down and bend his legs, as some persons have said, but from his great weight he is unable to bend them on both sides at once, but leans either to the right side or the left, and sleeps in this position;' the elephant, that is to say, having bent one foreleg, cannot then bend the other so as to kneel with both, which is contrary to fact. Aristotle demolishes the absurd statement that the elephant has no joints, in this passage in his 'History of Animals' (ii. 1, § 4), but in his treatise on the 'Progressive Motions of Animals' (*Περὶ Προρείας Ζώων*, cap. 9, p. 709, ed. Bekker), he seems to leave it doubtful whether the elephant has joints in its knees. After showing that without inflexion there can be no progression, he says: 'Progression, however, is possible without inflexion of the leg, in the same manner as infants creep; and there is an ancient story of this kind about elephants, which is not true, for such animals move because in-

* Hist. An. iii. 9, § 3. Beyond a doubt the passage is genuine, as the context clearly shows by the parenthesis. See Schneider's Annot. ad loc. iii. p. 147.

'flexion takes place in their shoulder-blades or hips.' The existence of such animals without knees is again supposed by this remark: 'Since the members are equal, inflexion must be made either in the knee or in some joint, if the animal that walks is destitute of knees' (*ἀγρόβατον*). If Aristotle had ever seen an elephant move, is it not probable that he would have spoken more decidedly and correctly on these points? Schlegel indeed asserts that the accounts of the elephant are the result of frequent and minute actual examination of both sexes of this animal, and that what he could not ascertain—viz., the beast's mode of life in its wild state—he doubtless ascertained from the Indian conductors of these animals which had been sent to Aristotle by Alexander; on this subject we shall remark by and by. But surely it was not necessary for correct observation to know the habits of the elephant in its wild state; a captive specimen would have equally answered such a purpose. Aristotle's assertion* that the male elephant arrives at puberty when he is five or six years old is quite erroneous; however, in another passage† he correctly gives the age at twenty years. But the most astonishing assertion is that 'the elephant cannot swim (*πρὶν δ' οὐ πᾶν δύναται*) on account of the weight of its body.'‡ Such a statement is one of Aristotle's many erroneous generalisations.

Aristotle's account of the camel is on the whole graphic and correct; he describes both the one-humped Arabian and the Bactrian species. He mentions the walk of the camel, stating that it moves with the hind foot following the fore foot on the same side. He twice repeats the statement that the camel has no teeth in the upper jaw. Doubtless he alludes to the front teeth, but the camel has two incisors in the upper jaw and two canines; so that Aristotle has 'not perfectly described and characterised the two species of camel.' Among other strange notions held by Aristotle, apparently without any misgivings, may be mentioned the lion having no cervical vertebræ, but only one bone in the neck,§ its bones, which are small and slight, being without marrow except a

* Hist. An. v. 12, § 14.

† Ibid. vi. 25, § 2.

‡ Ibid. ix. 33.

§ He repeats this statement in the De Part. iv. 10, p. 686, ed. Bekker, and joins wolves with lions, and gives his reason, 'Nature saw that these animals wanted the neck more for strength than for other purposes.' The cervical bones of the hyæna sometimes become ankylosed; and this may possibly have given rise to the one-neckbone theory.

little in the thigh and foreleg. Aristotle's notions with respect to the skull are peculiar: the brain is placed beneath the sinciput, 'and the occiput is empty,' an error twice repeated; women's skulls have only one suture, placed in a circle. He mentions as an extraordinary thing the fact of a man's skull having once been seen without any suture; he is copying Herodotus (ix. 83), who says such a skull was found on the battle-field of Plataea. The skull-sutures in aged persons are frequently obliterated. Again, 'the cranium of the dog consists of a single bone'—he must have got hold of an old specimen.

Certain abnormal deposits of bone which occasionally are found in diseased conditions of the heart in some of the mammalia were considered as necessary organs in the horse and some kind of oxen, 'which on account of their large size have a bony heart for the sake of support' (*ὄλον ἐπέσματος χάρτιν*).* The seal and some swine are said to have no gall-bladder. The absence of a gall-bladder in the seal is again stated in his treatise on 'The Parts of Animals';† its absence from the liver of some swine may possibly be explained, as MM. Aubert and Wimmer conceive, by supposing that the gall-bladder in certain fat pigs disappears in the substance of the liver. The gall-bladder is by no means constant in the mammalia, and Aristotle is correct in saying it is not present in the elephant, horse, stag, ass, and mule. It is difficult to know what he means when he says that the Achaïnian stags appear to have a gall in the tail; we are quite in the dark as to what these stags are. M. Saint-Hilaire, in a note,‡ considers the statement not absolutely fabulous as one would be inclined to think, because there is a species of stag, with large horns, which secretes under the tail a liquid not unlike bile, and he refers to MM. Aubert and Wimmer. Aristotle is probably referring to some story he has heard from hunters; but his mention of such a gland in connexion with true gall-bladders in certain animals is certainly curious; however, one cannot regard the animal otherwise than as fabulous, because in another place§ he mentions the same kind of stag, which when captured was found to have a considerable quantity of green ivy growing on its horns as on green wood. Buffon, however, seems to have thought the story possible. It will be noticed that Aristotle expressly says that such an animal had been captured, and, with his

* De Part. An. iii. cap. 4.

† ii. 11, § 7.

‡ iv. 2.

§ ix. 6, § 3.

authority to stamp the fable, no wonder it appears in Pliny, Albertus, and other writers. That Aristotle placed too much reliance on animal-lore, often marvellous or even impossible, current in his age is abundantly evident to any one who will be at the pains to examine his zoological writings. The deer come in for a full share of wonderful anecdote, e.g. :—

'The hind, as soon as she has produced her young, eats the chorion (fetal sac),* and then runs to the plant called *seselis*, which she eats, and then returns to her offspring.' 'The male sheds his horns in difficult and inaccessible places, hence the proverb, "Where the stag sheds its horns," for they take care not to be seen, since they have not their means of defence. It is said that the left horn has never yet been seen, for the animal hides it because it has some medical properties.' 'When stags are bitten by the phalangium, or other such creature, they collect together a number of crabs and eat them.'

These statements are made by Aristotle without a single hint that he does not believe them; had he regarded them as fabulous it is probable that he would have so expressed himself, as he is in the habit of doing when stories are regarded by him as 'unworthy of credit.'

Mr. G. H. Lewes mentions Cuvier as having instanced four generalisations to prove the immense acquaintance Aristotle must have had with particulars :—

'I will quote four others,' he adds; 'forty might be found, all taken from the first book, which exemplify plainly enough how easily large and careful induction could be dispensed with. 1. The lion has no cervical vertebrae, but a single bone in its neck. 2. Long-lived persons have one or two lines which extend through the whole hand; short-lived persons have two lines, and these do not extend through the whole hand. 3. Man has, in proportion to his size, the largest and the moistest brain. 4. The forehead is large in stupid men, small in lively men, broad in men predisposed to insanity (*ἰκστατικοί*), and round in high-spirited men' (Aristotle, p. 272).

All these beliefs, it is probable, were currently in vogue in Aristotle's time.

It is not certain whether Aristotle believed in the fable

* Many animals will occasionally eat the amnion or the placenta, but it is not their normal habit to do so as Aristotle imagines in the case of deer. The *seselis* is an umbelliferous plant, perhaps *Seseli tortuosum*, or the allied genus *Tordylium*, which, under the English name of Hartwort, tradition has associated with the *seselis* of Aristotle, on account of its supposed efficacy in aiding parturition in deer and other ruminants. Dioscorides (iii. 53) says that a decoction of the seeds and roots of the *seselis* used to be given to goats and sheep, *εἰς τὸς εὐροκίαν πορνόν*.

that the salamander was able to live in the fire, because the passage may be an interpolation, which is the opinion of M. Saint-Hilaire as well as of MM. Aubert and Wimmer. The passage runs thus:—

‘In Cyprus, where the stone called *chalcitis* is burnt by those who keep it up for many days, small winged creatures are produced in the fire, and there walk and leap about; and as certain larvæ, when taken from the snow, perish, so do these creatures when taken from the fire. That it is possible for some living organisms to exist in the fire without being burnt, the case of the salamander clearly shows, for this creature, they say, extinguishes the fire as it walks through it.’*

“M. Saint-Hilaire has the following footnote on this curious passage: ‘This fable of the salamander is without doubt posterior to the time of Aristotle, and its mention here clearly shows that the passage is apocryphal.’† As the story, however, is told by Theophrastus, Aristotle’s favourite pupil, to whom the philosopher bequeathed his library and original writings, M. Saint-Hilaire is not quite correct as to the late date of the salamander story. Theophrastus, speaking of certain things which extinguish fire, says, ‘if to such a moisture cold be also added, this operates towards extinction, as happens in the case of the salamander.’‡ He considered that the combination of the three qualities of cold, stickiness, and moisture was efficacious in extinguishing fire, all of which qualities he says are found in the salamander. We suspect the salamander fable was long anterior to the time of Aristotle, and that it had its original source in the East, perhaps in Persia, for the name of a fire-dwelling lizard occurs in Sanskrit, and our word salamander, like the Greek and Latin, appears under the form of *samandar* in Persian. Moreover, Pliny expressly tells us that the story comes from the Magi, and it is probable that it found its way into Greece and Rome through Democritus, who had travelled much in Eastern countries and who, according to Diogenes Laertius, had been a pupil of the Magi and Chaldeans. It is certain that many of the popular beliefs among the Greeks and Romans were introduced from an Eastern source; and though Aristotle, supposing that the passage is authentic, does not mention Democritus in connection with the salamander fable, this absence of the quotation of his authority is no proof against the supposition

* Hist. AN. v. 17, § 12, 13.

† Histoire des Animaux, v. xvii. § 19.

‡ De Igne, § 60; vol. i. p. 726, ed. Schneider.

of this source, because Aristotle not unfrequently quotes from authorities without mentioning their names when he does not consider it necessary to confute their statements. It is not improbable that the fable had originally some connection, in zoological mythology, with certain cosmical phenomena. Gubernatis writes: 'The Salamander of popular superstition seems to me to represent the moon, which lights itself, which lives by its own fire, which has no rays or hairs of its own, and which makes the rays or hairs of the sun fall.' One of the superstitions concerning the salamander was that though devoid of hairs itself, it causes the hairs of others to fall out by means of its saliva, whence Martial, cursing the baldness of a woman's head,

'Hoc salamandra caput aut sæva novacula nudet.'

Aristotle evidently had no high opinion of Herodotus's natural history stories, and doubtless he is right, but if the 'Father of History' is not always to be relied upon and merits the epithet of 'mythologist' given to him by Aristotle, sometimes even the 'Father of Natural History' is found credulous of impossible fable and popular folk-lore. In his treatise on 'The Generation of Animals'* Aristotle very severely reproves Herodotus for believing in the silly current talk (τὸν εὐήθη λόγον καὶ τεθρυλημένον) which fishermen indulge in, 'that female fishes are impregnated by gulping down the milt of the male, not seeing how impossible this is, for the entrance through the mouth leads to the belly and becomes food to nourish the fish, and not to the womb which contains the eggs.' But equally absurd is that which Aristotle asserts concerning the formation of eggs in hen partridges. 'They become pregnant if the wind blows to them from the males,† and often if they hear the voice of the male when they are excited, or if the males fly above them they become pregnant from their breath.‡' So again in his 'Treatise on the Generation of Animals'§ the same story is repeated. It is clear that Aristotle accepts as an absolute fact the silly assertions of the fowlers. On turning to M. Saint-Hilaire's note on

* Vol. i. p. 756, ed. Bekker.

† The quarter whence the wind blew was also supposed to influence the young of the sheep and goat; if at the time of coupling the parents faced the north, males would be produced, if the south, females, 'so that it was necessary to see that they stood to the north' if male young were desired (Hist. An. vi. 19, § 2).

‡ Hist. An. v. 4, § 7.

§ Vol. i. p. 751, ed. Bekker.

these wind-produced eggs, we find that the passage in the 'History of Animals' is regarded by him as a probable interpolation. But if we have to expunge this paragraph, what are we to do with a great deal of matter, bearing on this question, which occurs in the 'Generation of Animals'?

As another instance of Aristotle's ready acceptance of popular folk-lore, we may mention what he states as to the causes which were supposed to operate in the production of certain colours in sheep. 'There are certain waters in many places which produce black lambs if the sheep drink of them before conception, as at that in the Thracian Chalcis, which is called "Cold-river;" in Antandria there are two rivers, one of which turns the sheep black and the other white.*' Strabo, Pliny, Seneca, and others mention certain rivers which produce different-coloured sheep. Perhaps of all domesticated animals the sheep is liable to the greatest variety in respect to its wool, horns, &c.; and this difference is doubtless to be attributed to the conditions of climate and food principally. From time immemorial there have been white, black, and pied sheep; colour is generally esteemed of little importance, and there is not the slightest reason for supposing that the colour of the wool is in any way affected by the water which the animals drink. The presence of some particular plant in a locality where sheep feed might possibly determine the prevalence of one colour rather than another in a flock, because such a plant may be harmless to one colour and fatal to another, as for instance in the case which Darwin mentions of the inhabitants in the Tarentino, who keep black sheep alone, because the *Hypericum crispum* abounds there; and this plant does not injure the black sheep, but kills the white ones in about a fortnight's time. This, however, is a very different thing from water when drunk by the ewes influencing the colour of the lamb.

Aristotle's account of the halcyon, or king-fisher, is a curious mixture of fact and fiction, the latter, however, predominating largely.

'The halcyon is not much larger than a sparrow; its colour is blue and green, and inclining to purple; its whole body is a mixture of these colours, as well as the wings and the parts about the neck. The bill is somewhat yellow, long and slight. Such is its external form. The nest resembles the sea-balls called *halosachnæ*, except in colour, for the nest is somewhat red. In shape it resembles those *sicyæ* (sea-cucumbers) which have long necks; it is about the size of a large

* Hist. An. iii. 10, § 12.

sponge, but some are greater, others less. The nests are covered over and are thick and hard, as well as the inside. They are not easily cut by a person using a sharp knife, but when struck and crushed by the hands they quickly break up, like the *halosachnæ*. The mouth is narrow—only a little entrance—so that the water cannot get into it, even when the sea is rough. The hollow parts are like those of a sponge. It is a question as to what it is composed of, but it seems to consist chiefly of the spines of the belone. The bird itself lives on fish. It also ascends rivers. It lays generally about five eggs, and reproduces throughout its life, beginning when four months old.*

It is certain that the halcyon here described is the kingfisher, a bird well known to the ancients chiefly in connection with the old myth of Alcyone and Ceyx, but one whose natural habits they (Aristotle among the number) paid little attention to. In another place (v. 8, § 2 and 3) he says:—

‘Birds generally breed in the spring and the beginning of summer, but the kingfisher is an exception, for it produces its young about the time of the winter solstice;† wherefore fine days which happen at this season are called halcyon days, seven days before the solstice and seven days after it, as Simonides has written, as when Jupiter in the winter month prepares fourteen days, which mortals call the windless season, the sacred nurse of the variegated halcyon. . . . These halcyon days do not always happen in this country at the season of the solstice, but they nearly always occur in the Sicilian Sea.’

These extracts are sufficient to show that Aristotle accepted, without any misgivings as to their truth, the old fable, first apparently alluded to by Homer, and has recorded as actual natural history fact most of the errors and absurdities which the fable embodies. With the exception of the description of the kingfisher and of its fish diet, there is hardly a single statement that is true.‡

The nest of the kingfisher reminds us of that of another bird—viz. the partridge, which is said to make two nests (*ὠὸν σηκούς*), upon one of which the male incubates, on the other the female, and each hatches and brings up its own brood. And then follows the astounding statement that the male has intercourse with the young ones as soon as he

* Hist. An. ix. 15.

† The kingfisher breeds in the spring, as most birds do. The natural history fact is altered to make the season harmonise with the popular myth.

‡ M. Saint-Hilaire, in his note on ix. 15, § 3, as to the nests of these birds, writes:—‘Buffon conteste quelques-uns des détails donnés ici sur le nid de l’Halcyon; mais la minutie même de ces détails atteste que les anciens avaient observé les choses de très-près.’

leads them from the nest! (The same is said of pigeons.) Again:

'The male partridge, being a bird of strong passions, tries to prevent the female from incubating by rolling upon the eggs and breaking them. The female, by a counter artifice, lays her eggs as she runs along, and frequently, from her desire to have eggs, she drops them wherever she may happen to be if the male be (not) present.'

Few birds attracted more general attention amongst the Greeks than the hoopoe, and Aristotle, on the whole, has given a good description of its habits, though he has exaggerated the change in its plumage.

He quotes Æschylus on the change of its colour and form. The poet says:—

'Now this hoopoe, the spectator of its own evils (*ἐπόπτην ἔποπα τῶν αὐτοῦ κακῶν*), he has marked with various colours, and has displayed the bold rock-bird in full armour. In the beginning of spring it brandishes the wing of the white circus (hawk); for it will exhibit two forms, that of the young bird and of itself from one origin; and when the young ears of the corn have grown, it is clothed in variegated plumage.'

Aristotle's own words are: 'The hoopoe changes its colour and its form, as Æschylus writes.' Now, the plumage of the hoopoe is subject to less variety than occurs in most birds; the male and female do not differ, except that the colours of the male bird are a little more rich than in the female; there is no perceptible difference in the plumage in the spring and autumn, and the young closely resemble the parents. What is stated, however, with regard to the change in form is correct enough, and refers to the great development of the crest of the male during the spring, while the beak of the young bird is comparatively short and straight compared with that of the old one. In one passage he correctly states that the hoopoe makes no real nest, but lays its eggs in the stumps of hollow trees without building (vi. 1, § 3); but in another he astonishes us by quite another statement.*

Aristotle has some curious stories about eagles, and here too seems to depend upon the poets.

'The eagle lays three eggs, but hatches only two, as is also related

ὁ δ' ἐποψ τὴν νεοττίαν μάλιστα ποιεῖται ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης κόπρον (ix. 16, § 1). The offensive smell of the nest, from the droppings of the young, and the materials, such as pieces of dried cowdung, may have given rise to the story, which, however, when taken as it stands, can give only a very wrong idea of a hoopoe's nest.

in the poems of Musæus,* "the bird which lays three eggs, hatches two and cares only for one." Such things often occur, yet even three young ones have been seen in the nest. As the young grow, the old bird throws out one, because she grieves at the idea of feeding it (ὑχθόμενος τῇ ἔδωδι); at this time it is said to go without food, so that it need not capture the young of wild creatures. Its talons are then turned back for a few days, and its plumage becomes white, and it acts cruelly towards its young. . . . All eagles do not behave cruelly to their young.' 'The eagle appears to eject its young from the nest through envy, for it is an envious and hungry bird by nature, and quick at seizing its prey . . . it ejects them before the proper time, when they still need food, and are as yet unable to fly.' 'The sea eagle' (probably *Halietus albicilla*) 'is very quick-sighted, and compels its young ones, while still naked, to look at the sun, and if one of them will not do so it beats it and turns it round; and the young one which first weeps it kills, the other it rears.'

And then, after stating that certain sea-birds called κέπφοι (perhaps 'petrels') 'are captured with foam which they 'devour,' and a few other remarks, Aristotle thus concludes his ornithological instructions: 'This, then, is the 'nature of birds.'

There can be no doubt that Babylonia, Persia, and Egypt supplied the Greeks and Romans with much of their animal-lore; the old story, so celebrated in classic literature, about the swan singing before her death, comes probably from an Egyptian source. Aristotle accepts the myth as if it were fact. 'Swans are musical, especially when near the end of 'their life; for they fly out even to the sea, and some persons sailing near Libya have met with many of them in 'the sea singing a mournful song, and have seen some of 'them die.' Horapollo says 'that when the Egyptians 'wished to symbolise an old minstrel they depict a swan, 'for when old it sings the sweetest melody.' There is no very great difference between the two myths; and when we know that certain other Greek fables can be traced directly to an Egyptian source it is probable the same is the case with the swan.† It is curious to notice that Pliny discredits

* Apparently some semi-mythological person like Orpheus. His line runs ὅς τρία μὲν τίττει, δύο δ' ἐκλέπει, ἓν δ' ἀλεγίζει, which Scaliger well renders by 'Terna parit, binis exclusis educat unum.'

† The following old folk-lore beliefs may be found both in Horapollo and Aristotle, with some slight difference of detail—that eggs may be fertilised by the wind; that goats breathe through their ears; that the hyæna is double-sexed; that the lioness never conceives twice; that stags may be caught by music; that partridges are incontinent; that when eagles grow old their beaks cross and they die of hunger; that

the story. 'Horum morte narratur flebilis cantus, falso, ut arbitror, aliquot experimentis' (x. 23).

The old notion that the cubs of the bear are, when first born, shapeless and require to be moulded into form by the mother's tongue finds itself, in part at least, supported by the authority of Aristotle.

'The female bear produces a young one, the smallest of any animal compared with the size of her own body; it is less than a weasel and greater than a mouse; it is naked and blind, and its legs and all its members are almost without joints.'

The young bear when just born is very small, about the size of a large fat rat, but it is covered with hair. Two or three stuffed specimens of newly-born bears, brown and polar, may be seen in the galleries of the British Museum at South Kensington. Aristotle makes no mention of the bear licking its cub into shape, which may or may not have been an idea of later growth. Ovid thus writes:—

'Nec catulus, partu quem reddidit ursa recenti,
Sed male viva caro est: lambendo mater in artus
Ducit, et in formam, qualem capit ipsa, reducit.*

The notion prevailed for ages after Aristotle, and the common English expression of an 'unlicked cub' is doubtless a relic of the old fable. Matthioli (born circ. 1500), the eminent physician of Tuscany and commentator on Dioscorides, showed about the middle of the sixteenth century the error of the unformed-cub story; he says:—

'When I was in the valley of Anania above Trent, I saw a very large pregnant female bear, which had been eviscerated by the hunters. The cubs were in the womb, with all their members distinct and formed, by no means without shape, as many think, relying more on the authority of Aristotle and of Pliny (who have handed down this story) than on their senses and experience.†

According to Horapollo (ii. 83), if the Egyptians wished to symbolise a man who was born deformed, but afterwards had acquired his proper shape, 'they delineate a pregnant bear which brings forth a mass of condensed blood, which is made into shape by being licked with its tongue.'

the hawk lays three eggs, breaks two, and hatches only one. Aristotle distinctly refutes three of these as absurd. One cannot positively assert that all these fables came originally from Egypt, but we think it probable.

* Met. xv. 379–381.

† Comment. in Dioscor. p. 206, ed. 1558.

Among other curiosities of zoological literature, mentioned by Aristotle, which seem to receive his support, and which may be set down as the current folk-lore of his time, we may enumerate the following:—‘If anyone make a noise as grasshoppers fly along, they emit a kind of moisture, as agriculturists say; they feed on dew, and if a person advances to them bending his finger and then straightening it, they will remain more quiet than if the finger is put out straight at once, and will climb up the finger, for from bad sight they ascend it as if it were a moving leaf.’ ‘Persons who have parasites (*φθειρες*) in the head are less subject to headache. Moths are produced in the greatest abundance if a spider is shut up with them in the wool, for this creature being thirsty dries up any moisture which may be present. Small birds during the day fly round the owl—which is called admiring it—and as they fly round it they pluck out its feathers.’ ‘The anthus’ (some bright-coloured bird) ‘is an enemy to the horse, for it drives the horse from its pasture and eats the grass, it imitates the voice of the horse and frightens it by flying at it, but when the horse catches it he kills it.’ ‘If anyone takes hold of a she-goat by the long hairs of the beard, all the others stand still as if bewildered (*μεμωρωμένα*) and gaze at her.’ ‘The hawk, though carnivorous, does not eat the hearts of the birds it has killed.’ ‘The jay (*κίττα*) has many varieties of voice; it utters a different one, so to speak, every day.’ ‘The goat-sucker flies against the she-goats and sucks them, whence its name. They say that, after the udder has been sucked, it becomes dry and goes blind.’* ‘Mares become less ardent and more gentle if their manes are cut.† At cer-

* Ælian (iii. 39) and Pliny (x. 40) repeat this absurd and injurious statement. We cannot trace it in any writer prior to Aristotle. The delusion continues to this day in some parts of this country, and the insect-eating night-jar suffers.

† ὅταν ἀποκείρωται. This remark about mares contains a very curious bit of old folk-lore. MM. Aubert and Wimmer, as usual, consider the passage apocryphal. M. Saint-Hilaire properly refuses to sanction its rejection. We may add that it has the express confirmation of Ælian (xi. 18), who refers to Aristotle by name as his authority. Rejection of the passage is wholly unwarranted. Xenophon, Plutarch, Ælian, and Pliny give us the same bit of folk-lore about mares. Xenophon (‘De Re Equit.’ c. 5) says that the mane, tail, and forelock were given to the horse by the gods as an additional beauty; consequently, that when the mane was clipped the mare lost her pride and dignity, became dejected on seeing her reflection in

'tain times they never run to the east or west, always north 'or south.' 'The sow gives the first teat to the first little 'pig that is born.' When a serpent has taken its food, 'it draws itself up till it stands erect upon its tail (*ἐπὶ τὸ 'ἄκρον*).'

Aristotle's reasons are sometimes amusing. Man has no tail because the available formative material has been used up in the posterior parts (buttock). Apes have neither tail nor buttocks because they are intermediate between man and quadrupeds. Bees and wasps have stings inside their bodies because they have wings. All crabs and lobsters (generally) have the large claw on the right, because all animals are by nature strong on the right side. Bees and ants are more intelligent than other animals of the kind, because their blood (fluid answering to blood) is thin and cold. The seal has no external ears, only ear-pores, because its feet are incapacitated for walking (*πεπηρωμένον*). Serpents have a forked tongue because they are gluttonous, and a bifid tongue has a double-tasting power. Man is the only animal that is tickled, because his skin is fine; and he is the only animal that laughs, and 'tickling (*γαργαλισμός*) is 'laughter from a motion of this kind about the armpit,' which, as Mr. Lewes says, is 'a physiological explanation 'rather difficult to understand.' Insects eat little because their bodies are cold. It is curious to notice that Aristotle had no idea that insects produced eggs—they bring forth worms; he evidently took the larva stage as the normal birth-form. These instances are taken from the treatise 'On the Parts of Animals.'

But we need quote no farther, though it would be easy to supply many more samples of a like character; but surely these will incline us to refuse to admit that 'in his accumulation of facts, Aristotle has not written one useless word; 'neither are we able to see with M. Saint-Hilaire, from the study of the *History of Animals*, 'an originality which 'nothing had prepared, even as nothing completely new has 'followed it.' M. Saint-Hilaire speaks of Aristotle's incessant practice of anatomy; it seems to us that he did not practise anatomy on any extended scale; that he occasionally dis-

water, and humbly submitted to the solicitations of the male ass; that breeders of mules adopted this tonsure system on this account. M. Saint-Hilaire's note that the words of Aristotle are better applicable to stallions than to mares, shows that he has failed to discern the point in question.

sected animals, is, however, certain from his own remarks here and there,* but he also mentions anatomical drawings as existing in his time and before him, and refers his readers to them. Had Aristotle habitually dissected animals, it is impossible that he could have made the incorrect assertions that he has on numerous points of observation not difficult of detection or demonstration. It is chiefly, we imagine, amongst marine creatures that he practised dissection, and to which he paid most personal attention; and certainly, many of his observations are admirably correct on some of the fishes, for instance, sponges, crustacea, cephalopoda, and other sea creatures.† Aristotle's father was a man of some scientific culture, and anatomy probably formed one part in his boyhood education, which study he continued to some extent in after years. His was an all-grasping mind—an ambition to know all subjects; but in zoological matters constant observations and repeated verifications are necessary to establish fact, and observation and verification were not Aristotle's strong points; his anatomical knowledge was very limited, and, as Mr. G. H. Lewes says, 'to explain the phenomena of life without having previously mastered the facts of anatomy, is as hopeless as to attempt an explanation of the action of a watch in ignorance of springs, escapement, and wheels, merely from seeing it wound up and hearing it tick. Nothing but vague, unassured guesses can be formed. Of this kind is the physiology of Aristotle.' Had Aristotle any acquaintance with human anatomy from actual dissection? It appears to us almost certain that Hippocrates (nearly contemporary with Aristotle) and other medical authorities of antiquity occasionally at least practised *inspectiones cadaverum*. The human body was openly dissected in the anatomical schools of Alexandria considerably less than one hundred years after the death of Hippocrates; it is, therefore, highly probable that the practice had prevailed before that time, though not to the same extent. Hippocrates was by profession a physician, and probably taught anatomy in his school; and there seems good reason

* See Hist. An. v. 16, § 5, where certain organs of the cuttle fish (sepia) are explained by reference to letters A, B, Γ, Δ in a diagram.

† Eels are of course discussed; they were supposed to be produced spontaneously from the mud and not from eggs. Though there are some points in the generation of eels which remain obscure to this day, we know that they are produced from eggs; the milt of the conger eel was discovered a few years ago, and much has been learnt. M. Saint-Hilaire's zoology is not very recent.

for believing that on physiological questions Aristotle borrowed freely from that most eminent physician of antiquity. Aristotle may sometimes have been present at the examination of human bodies, but it is pretty certain that he never carried on anything like systematic operations, never *dissected* in the modern technical acceptance of that term. If he had, would he have said that the kidneys of a man resembled those of a ox, and 'consist of many little reniform bodies (*ἐκ πολλῶν νεφρῶν μικρῶν*) and are not smooth like those of sheep or other four-footed creatures'? * or that the uterus is double; or that the heart is placed above the lungs near the bifurcation of the trachea; † that the brain is without blood, and that the back part of the skull is empty?—a statement frequently made. If Aristotle did dissect human bodies, then, as Mr. Lewes remarks: 'An answer in the affirmative would be still more damaging to his reputation, since it would render many of his errors unpardonable.' The evidence, we think, is almost conclusive that he did not dissect human bodies.

There seems much reason to believe that he paid little attention to the examination of the skeletons of animals, and that his osteological knowledge was very limited. Let us consider what he has recorded of a certain bone, well known to the Greeks as being one much used for dice and some other purposes—we, of course, mean the astragalus. 'Many cloven-footed animals,' he says, 'have an astragalus, but no many-toed animals have one, neither has man; the lynx has as it were half an astragalus, the lion one in the form of a coil (*λαβυρινθώδη*); solid-hoofed animals, with the exception of the Indian ass, have no astragalus, swine have not a well-formed astragalus.' ‡ The fact is that the hind feet of all mammals possess this bone, with slight differences in form and relative position with the other tarsal bones, but always preserving their characteristic shape. Aristotle recognises this bone only, as a rule, in the ruminants, and denies its existence generally in the hind feet of other animals. This bone was familiar to him as occurring in the sheep and goat, because they supplied principally the dice used originally in the Greek game. Had he examined the hind feet of the animals which he specifies as having no

* De Part. iii. 9, p. 671, ed. Bekker. † Hist. An. i. 14, § 1.

‡ οὐ καλλιαστράγαλον, perhaps, 'not prettily shaped' like the tarsal bone of the gazelle (*δορκίς*), which was much prized. See Polybius, xxvi. 10. 9.

astragalus, he could not have committed such an error; had he been in the habit of dissecting animals for osteological information, he must have noticed the uniform presence of this characteristic tarsal bone in the mammalia.

Aristotle had a theory—a kind of physiological axiom—that led him to infer that certain animals could not have an astragalus, and therefore he did not examine them to prove his theory; he was satisfied that his theory proved his facts, and there was no need of verification. We shall see this in the following passage from his 'Parts of Animals,' where he gives his reason why certain animals have no astragalus.

'The feet of quadrupeds differ, for some animals have one hoof, others a cloven foot, others many divisions in the foot. One-hoofed animals are those which, on account of their large size and abundance of earthy matter, have secreted such matter for the formation of nail or hoof, instead of horns and teeth, and on account of this superabundance, instead of many nails have only one—a solid hoof. Hence, on this account, to speak generally, such animals have not an astragalus, for if they had one, the joint of the hind leg would be moved with greater difficulty, because parts with one angle open and shut more readily than parts with many angles; but the astragalus, a kind of wedge (*γόμφος*) is fixed as a foreign member in two other bones; it has weight indeed, but conduces to the security of the step. On this account animals which have an astragalus have it in the hind feet, and not in the fore, because the parts which move first ought to be light and flexible, whereas the hind parts require security and tension (*τάσεις*). Moreover, animals without this bone can give a more heavy blow in defending themselves, such, for instance, as use their hind legs, and kick at what hurts them. But animals with cloven feet have an astragalus, for they are lighter behind; and because they have an astragalus they have not solid hoofs, the bony matter which is wanting in the foot serving for flexure. But many-toed animals have not an astragalus, otherwise they would not be many-toed, but cleft for so much of the breadth of the foot as the astragalus occupies' (iv. 10, p. 690, ed. Bekker).

His argument is mainly as follows, from what may be clearly gathered from several other passages: large animals have in their system much earthy matter (*γεώδες*), the superabundance of such matter (*ἡ περισσώματικὴ ὑπερβολή*) nature uses in the formation of teeth, tusks, and horns; in solid-hoofed animals, as in a horse for instance, the excess of earthy matter goes to form the hoof, and not horns or tusks as it does in cattle and elephants; and as this excess is spent in the formation of a solid hoof, such animals have no astragalus, which is only a kind of superadded bone, and would be, in the horse for instance, a detriment rather than an advantage. With such conceptions Aristotle ima-

gined the phenomena of nature must correspond, and hence the true guide, 'the Ariadne-thread by which the real issues 'may be found,' viz. verification, was neglected, and error promulgated.

The mention of the Indian ass, which Aristotle receives with some degree of incredulity, as coming from Ctesias, whom he describes as a man 'unworthy of credit' (*οὐκ ὄν ἀξιόπιστος*), suggests a few remarks. The Indian ass, as described by Ctesias* is fabulous altogether, but it is interesting as being the origin of the unicorn, which even now supports the arms of England. The Indian rhinoceros in all probability is at the bottom of the story told by Ctesias. The astragalus of this animal was prized by the Indian hunters, who pursued it for the sake of its horns as well. Ctesias was shown the astragalus, which he says was 'the most beautiful he ever beheld, in shape and size 'like that of the ox, but heavy as lead, its colour resembled 'cinnabar throughout its whole substance' (*καὶ διὰ βύθους*). The description will suit the astragalus of the rhinoceros well enough; of course the specimen Ctesias saw had been artificially stained with some red dye, and perhaps leaded. Drinking-cups were made out of its horn, and filings of the same were used as an antidote against poison, spasms, and other diseases. Drinking-vessels and cups are to this day made from the horn of the rhinoceros in the interior of Africa, where the unicorn (*Anasa* of the natives) is nothing more than the rhinoceros; the people attribute to the horn the very same properties which Ctesias did. Although some of the stories about the strange animals and plants which Ctesias gives can be explained to some extent, making great allowance for the marvellous, it is quite impossible to deny that several of them are pure unmitigated fables. Not, however, that we believe Ctesias to be, as some have supposed, a mere fabricator of lies, a sort of classical Baron Munchausen, one who, in the words of Lucian, 'neither 'saw what he relates nor heard it from any one else.' On the contrary, we believe that he is perfectly truthful, that he heard from the Persians their strange stories of certain animals and plants of India, which perhaps they themselves credited, and that he has simply given their accounts. He never visited India himself, and he accepts too credulously no doubt the marvellous stories which he had heard. Herein may be a strong contrast between the philosophic mind of

* Indica, caps. 25-27, p. 25, ed. Baehr.

Aristotle and the unquestioning credulity of Ctesias, though, like Homer, even Aristotle *aliquando dormit*. We have taken the trouble to analyse carefully all that Ctesias has written in his fragmentary account of India. He mentions about fifty subjects, some in a few words, some in many. Several of these may be explained, making allowance for the usual exaggerations and love of the marvellous which attend all natural history anecdotes, unless checked by strict scientific investigation. His dog-headed cave-men; his pygmies with ears reaching to their shoulders, which meet together and cover the back behind; the worm (*σκώληξ*), the only creature of the river Indus, with two teeth and a body which a child can scarcely span with his two hands, which drags camels and oxen into the water and devours them all but the entrails; the griffins; the *dicernus* bird, which philanthropically hides its deadly excrement; the *martichoras*, of lion-like form and human visage, that shoots forth poisonous darts from its scorpion-like tail—a figure of which may be seen in old Topsell, and which has been lately reproduced by Miss Phipson in her ‘Animal Lore of Shakespeare’—all these, with others, are simply creatures of the imagination, like the stone and wood adornments of ecclesiastical buildings of mediæval architecture; but Ctesias gives a short but fairly correct account of the parrot, the bird which speaks with human tongue; his worm-like creatures of the size and of the colour of cinnabar, which infest trees, are probably some species of cochineal insect (*coccus*); his swift, fierce, and ironlike *crocottus* imitating man's voice is the *Hyæna crocuta*, still found in Ethiopia; and there is no very great exaggeration in the idea, as any one can testify who has heard the curious voice of the laughing hyena. He has given a fair account of the large Indian mastiff, the same animal which the Assyrian kings employed in the chase of wild beasts; his small sheep and cattle may be even now seen in India, as in the little Zebu; while his mention of a variety of iron which, when fixed in the ground averts storms and lightnings recalls to our mind the lightning-conductor of modern days. We acknowledge the fabulous character of many stories in his ‘Indica,’ but we object to Aristotle's stigma on the good faith of Ctesias, when, as in the treatise on the ‘Generation of Animals,’ he speaks of the Greek physician of Artaxerxes as a manifest liar (*φανερὸς ψευδόμενος*).

Aristotle had no high opinion of Herodotus as a relater of natural history subjects, and he convicts him of some very

absurd statements, stigmatising him as a 'mythologist.' When Herodotus is wrong, Aristotle refutes him sometimes by name, sometimes under the expression 'some say;' it is, however, noticeable that when Aristotle accepts the accounts which Herodotus gives of certain animals, he does not hesitate to appropriate his remarks without a word as to his authority; he makes use of them as if they were his own. This is very evident in the accounts of the crocodile and hippopotamus. In the case of the great saurian of the Nile, all that Aristotle tells us is borrowed from Herodotus, with the exception of the number of eggs it is said to lay; and it is curious to notice that he even tells the story of the little bird (*trochilos*) which eats the leeches out of the crocodile's mouth—a story long discredited, but which has been to a great extent corroborated by M. Geoffroy-Saint-Hilaire, the eminent French naturalist, who long resided in Egypt and had repeated occasions to ascertain that the story of Herodotus was correct, in substance at least. He found that a little bird, the black-headed plover (*Pluvianus aegyptius*), flies incessantly from place to place, searching everywhere, even in the crocodile's mouth, for insects, such as gnats, which attack the great saurian in innumerable swarms, and entering his mouth, cover the inner surface of the palate with a brownish black crust. The little plover comes and delivers him from his troublesome enemies. That curious friendships exist between animals widely different from each other in form and habit, is well known to naturalists; we may instance the case of the rhinoceros and hippopotamus, which are often attended by little birds known as rhinoceros-birds, which feed on the ticks and other parasites that infest these beasts, and which serve as well to warn them of approaching danger; the great pachyderms fully understand the bird's warning, and doubtless appreciate its good offices. The ancient Greeks and Romans do not appear to have been very scrupulous in the acknowledgement of their sources of information. Herodotus borrowed his description of the hippopotamus from Hecataeus, and his account of the mode adopted by the Egyptians for catching the crocodile, as well as his story of the phoenix; and certainly writes as if he was the originator of his narratives. Aristotle borrowed from Herodotus; perhaps Hecataeus told his own story. Though Aristotle depended to a considerable extent on his own observations, it is certain that he drew largely from other sources. Schneider on this point writes:—

'Aristotle had very likely more authorities whom he has followed or converted to his own purposes than those whose names he has given. There are, however, a few whom he has named, as Alcmaeon of Crotona, Dionysius of Apollonia, Heradorus of Heracleum in Pontus, the father of Bryson the sophist, Otesias of Cnidos, Herodotus of Halicarnassus, Syennesis of Cyprus, Polypus, Democritus of Abdera, Anaxagoras of Clazomene, Empedocles of Sicily. . . . There are many places, both in his Natural History and his other works on animals, where our philosopher refers to the ancient fables of men who were transformed into the nature and forms of various animals. . . . All who have read the work of Antoninus and the Metamorphoses of Ovid, will easily perceive how much information on the nature and habits of animals our philosopher could have derived from the very character of the books which had come down from the remotest antiquity to the time of Aristotle, especially if they bear in mind that the ancient teachers of physics always compared the habits of animals with those of man, and conjectured the causes and reasons of their actions from similar impulses in man. This may be seen in the fables of Æsop, for they contain the first elements of the ancients in physics and morals.' (Cresswell's translation.)

We cannot help thinking that much of Aristotle's human anatomy and physiology was derived from Hippocrates, whom, however, he only mentions once, and that Democritus supplied him with a good deal of matter on the forms and habits of various animals. M. B.-Saint-Hilaire has well said in his interesting preface that 'amongst all the predecessors of Aristotle, Democritus is the one from whom he has been able to borrow most; that in the opinion of every one Democritus was the wisest of the Greeks before the time of Aristotle; and that the acquirements of Democritus seem to have been as varied, if not as profound, as those of Aristotle.'

Speaking of the 'History of Animals,' looked at absolutely in relation to the science of which it treats, Mr. Lewes makes one remark at all events which we cannot altogether endorse; he says, 'there is not one good description in it.' We, on the contrary, consider there are many. Let us take two or three examples: Aristotle is nowhere more happy in his descriptions than when he is discoursing of marine animals. What seaside observer is unacquainted with the sea-squids, known to naturalists by the name of tunicated molluscs, or ascidians?

'The creatures called tethya have of all animals the most peculiar nature, for their whole body is concealed in a shell, which is intermediate between skin and shell, so that it can be cut like hard leather. The shell-like substance grows upon rocks. It has two pores distinct from each other, very small and not readily seen, by which it emits

and takes in water. When opened, one sees first of all that it has a gristle-like membrane within, lining the shell-like substance, and in this is the fleshy substance of the tethya itself, unlike that of other creatures, for the flesh is homogeneous throughout. It is united in two places to the membrane and the skin on the side, and in the point of union it is narrower on each side. By these places it extends to the outside pores which pass through the shell. There it both emits and takes in food and moisture, as if one were the mouth and the other the vent; the one is somewhat thick, the other thin. In the inside also there is a cavity at each end, and a middle part which forms continuous partitions.* In one of the cavities there is moisture; besides this it has no sensitive or organic part. . . . The colour of the tethya is partly yellow, partly red.'

On the whole this is a good popular description of a tunicated ascidian; a scientific one was impossible without the aid of the microscope, and, as was to be expected, the description is not strictly speaking scientifically correct. Aristotle has also given a very good descriptive account of the chameleon, though one cannot expect that he would be perfectly accurate in all the details. He mentions the structure of the ribs, how they descend and are joined together on the hypogastric region, the serrated back, the prehensile tail, the number and position of the toes; 'its eyes are fixed in a hollow and are large and round, surrounded with skin like the rest of the body; in the centre there is a small space left for the sight, through which an aperture it sees, and this part is never covered with skin. It turns round its eyes in a circle and can direct its vision to all sides and can see what it wishes. The change in the colour of the skin occurs when the animal is filled with air.' It is curious that he does not mention the peculiar structure of the tongue-bone, or the vermiform tongue, extensile and retractile, by means of which the creature catches the insects and larvæ on which it feeds; and that he takes no notice of its great lungs. He is incorrect

* καὶ διέρρηγαι μέσον τι συνεχές. Aristotle is, we think, alluding to the respiratory sac, i.e. to the quadrangular interspaces or square meshes formed by the longitudinal and transverse vessels which form a kind of network throughout the whole of the bronchial sac, which in some large ascidia are visible to the naked eye. M. Saint-Hilaire translates the words 'il y a un petit corps continu qui y fait cloison,' and thinks they may possibly refer to the ganglion between the two tubular orifices. Such a small object could not possibly be discerned without the aid of a microscope of considerable magnifying power. Moreover, Aristotle knew nothing whatever either of nerves or nerve-ganglia, and there is no mention of the epithet 'small' in the original.

in saying there is no spleen, which organ is always present in the reptilia, and that the chameleon has no blood except about the heart.

Aristotle gives a very good description of a hermit-crab, that curious occupant of univalves familiar to all observers:—

‘The creature called *carcinium* resembles both the malacostraca (*crustacea*) and the ostracodermata (*testacea*), for it is like in its nature to the *carabi* (lobsters). It is born naked, but because it clothes itself with a shell, and lives in it, it is like the *testacea*, and thus it partakes of the nature of both these classes. In shape, to speak plainly, it is like a spider, except that the lower part of the head and thorax is larger. It has two thin red horns, and two large eyes below these, not within nor turned on one side like those of the crab, but straight forwards. Below these is the mouth, and round it many hairlike appendages. Next to these there are two divided feet, with which it seizes its prey, and two besides these on each side, and a third pair smaller. Below the thorax the whole creature is soft, and when opened is yellow within. It does not grow to the shell, like the *purpura* and the *ceryx*, but is easily freed from it.’*

This is a fair general description of a hermit-crab (*pagurus*), but it is not sufficiently precise for the determination of the species.

Aristotle had an ardent love and admiration of nature, and in nature he always saw the beautiful, though he, like the Greek philosophers generally, seldom cared to be demonstrative in the expression of his feelings. The following passage from his treatise ‘On the Parts of Animals’ has deservedly attracted the admiring attention of M. Saint-Hilaire:—

Having already treated of these subjects, and given what is our opinion about them, it remains for us now to speak of animated nature (*περί τῆς ζώϊκῆς φύσεως*), omitting nothing, as far as lies in our power, whether it be ignoble or honourable; for even in those things which seem less pleasing to our senses in our contemplation of them, Nature, the creator of all things (*ἡ δημιουργήσασα φύσις*), affords inconceivable pleasures to those able to discover the causes of things and are philosophers by nature. For it would be unexpected and strange indeed if, when looking at images of things, we rejoice when we survey the art that produced them, whether in painting or sculpture, and do not rather love the sight of the actual works of Nature when we are able to discover their causes. Hence we ought not to regard with disgust, in a childish way, the inspection of the more ignoble animals, because in all Nature’s works there is something wonderful; and as Heracleitus is said to have addressed certain strangers who wished to see him, and who, having found him warming himself by the kitchen

* Hist. An. iv. 4, § 14.

fire, stopped, and he bade them enter without fear, "for even here," said he, "are the gods," in like manner, in investigations concerning each living creature we must approach without notions of a painful spectacle, because in all things there is something of nature and of beauty.'*

The story told by Pliny and Athenæus that Aristotle received many animals from India through the generous liberality of Alexander is very improbable indeed, and there is nothing in Aristotle's zoological works to lead one to suppose that any Indian animals had been sent to him. Humboldt, Schneider, Grote, and others have rejected the tradition without hesitation. The notices of the forms and habits of Asiatic animals are often brief, and generally inaccurate, and were probably derived by Aristotle, as Humboldt says, from information obtained by him quite independently of the Macedonian expeditions, from Persia and from Babylon, the centre of such widely-extended trading intercourse. We agree with M. Saint-Hilaire that we owe the 'History of Animals' and the other zoological works of Aristotle to the genius of the author, the comprehensive mind, the untiring industry, the love of knowledge which had no bounds, the admiration of nature which characterised this great Greek philosopher; and we are grateful for the possession of his writings; but we must not exaggerate the value of his natural history writings, we must not pay an absurd homage to antiquity by placing the pretensions of the ancients upon an equality with those of the moderns, as Buffon, Cuvier, and others have done; for, as the author of one of the Bridgewater Treatises has well said: 'The question does not regard the original powers of the mind, but the amount of accumulated knowledge on which those powers are to be exercised; and it would indeed be extraordinary if, inverting the analogy of individuals, the world should not be wiser in its old age than it was in its infancy.' Antecedently to the knowledge of the circulation of the blood, the true character of respiration and of the nervous system, zoological science was impossible and error inevitable. Before the invention of the microscope physiological knowledge could make very little advance. Had Aristotle lived in our age we should have seen him, we imagine, in the noble army of Darwin and Huxley, and other patient investigators of the phenomena of nature and of the working of nature's laws. Verification of facts, the cautious proof that certain

* De Part. An. i. 4, p. 645, ed. Bekker.

organic structures *do* occur in such and such animals, would take the place of the statement that they *must* occur in accordance with some presupposed theory, and thus true knowledge would increase, and there would be no need for imagination to supply the deficiencies of observation.

We must not conclude this article without a few words of hearty congratulation to the veteran French translator of Aristotle's works, M. Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire. The 'Histoire des Animaux d'Aristote,' in three handsome, well-printed volumes, his latest translation, appears to be exceedingly well done; it accurately represents the Greek, and is accompanied by copious useful footnotes,* and an exhaustive index, and although we cannot share with him his almost unqualified praise of Aristotle as a writer of natural history, and fail to see such an 'unheard-of multiplicity of facts observed with so much exactness' as he has discovered, we are glad to bear witness to the great merit of his translation. It is a valuable addition to Aristotelian literature, and will, we think, add fresh lustre to the honoured name of Saint-Hilaire.

* We could wish that the footnotes sometimes contained more definite zoological information. We turn to M. Saint-Hilaire's note on the mole (*ἀσπάλαξ*). He does not tell us whether Aristotle's animal is the insectivorous *Talpa* or the rodent mole-rat (*Spalax typhus*). The correctness of Aristotle depends on this question. If he is speaking of the common mole he is wrong when he says 'it has no apparent eyes, being covered with skin,' for, as Sir Thomas Browne remarks, 'that moles have eyes in their head is manifested unto any one that wants them not in his own.' If Aristotle is speaking of the *Spalax*, or mole-rat, he is quite right, for this creature's eyes are covered with the skin. Fortunately there is one word in Aristotle's account which settles the question, viz. *χανλιόδοντας* (Hist. An. iv. 8, § 2) spoken of the teeth. This word is frequent in Aristotle's zoological treatises, and refers to the prominent teeth of certain creatures, as the tusks of the elephant and wild-boar. Now the teeth of the *Spalax* are long, conspicuous, and chisel-shaped, and may well be called *χανλιόδοντες*. MM. Aubert and Wimmer think this passage containing a notice of the brain channels (*πόροι νευρώδεις*) is a later interpolation. If it be so, it shows that the interpolator had interpreted Aristotle's animal as the *Spalax*, and not the insectivorous *Talpa*, but the question as to what special animals are denoted in Greek and Latin authors generally by the words *ἀσπάλαξ*, *σπάλαξ*, and *talpa*, opens out a subject too wide for present discussion.

ART. VII.—1. *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century; or, the Irish Massacres of 1641–2. Their Causes and Results.* By MARY HICKSON. With a Preface by J. A. FROUDE, M.A. Vols. I. and II. London: 1884.

2. *Cromwell in Ireland; a History of Cromwell's Irish Campaign.* By the Rev. DENIS MURPHY, S.J. With Maps, Plans, and Illustrations. Dublin: 1883.

IT is impossible to deny that the misfortunes of Ireland during the last three centuries have been due less to the territorial greed or to the religious fanaticism of the English, than to the fact that more than once she deliberately imperilled our national existence by an alliance with our greatest enemies. When our Protestantism exposed us to the menacing schemes of Catholic Europe in the sixteenth century, and when even the Popes, as Döllinger significantly reminds us, strove by foreign invasion and civil war to break up that fabric of political independence which the Tudors had established in England, Ireland became a place of the first strategic importance to Spain. Then, in the struggle of the seventeenth century between Charles I. and his Parliament, the Irish took advantage of our divisions to strike a blow for their independence, which threatened to place us at the mercy of a despotic monarchy. It was not merely that an Irish army was raised to make war upon England in the interest of Charles I.—‘that army which,’ as Pym said, ‘was to bring us to a better order’—but that the outbreak of 1641, followed by ten years of anarchy, threatened the very existence of the Empire. Then, when a fresh effort was made to sacrifice our liberties forty years after, the Irish again flung themselves across our path, with France as an ally instead of Spain, only to involve themselves in still deeper misfortunes. This ended the long struggle between freedom and authority in England. Now it is a very easy task for historians to denounce the severities of English rule at periods so tremendously critical in our history; but it is an act of the most flagrant injustice to ignore all those circumstances in our position which tended to palliate, if they could not justify, the extreme and terrible rigour of our treatment of Ireland. We frankly acknowledge that the course of events having made it so perfectly clear that the possession of Ireland, not to say her cordial support, was indispensable to our safety, we ought to have recognised the duty of governing the country henceforth in

the interests of its people, respecting the rights of conscience and of property, and anticipating by a century the benefits of that union which was sought at last, like the earlier union with Scotland, as a great political necessity for both countries. History tells how a very different course was taken, and is not altogether silent respecting its cause. If the Revolution, which established the liberties of England, unhappily prepared the way for the ascendancy of a Protestant oligarchy over a Catholic nation, humiliated by a long succession of defeats, crushed into absolute helplessness, without institutions or property to defend, with nothing but injuries to redress and wrongs to avenge, the cause is to be found, not in the circumstances of this last contest at all, but in the events of the terrible autumn and winter of 1641-2. If there is any truth in history, what Mirabeau said prophetically of the French Revolution was true in a sense of Ireland: 'You will have massacres; you will have 'butcheries; you will not have the execrable honour of a 'civil war.'

Now it ought not to be difficult to ascertain the actual facts of the Irish rebellion any more than of the incidents of the contemporary struggle in England, because there is no lack of evidence supplied by the actors, the sufferers, or the spectators, in the bloody conflict. But the very greatness of the interest involved in the contest has helped to deface, and even to falsify, the record, and to make impartiality so difficult that the history of events which we could all wish to bury in oblivion has become rather an incentive to fresh atrocities than a warning against them. The question in hand is to be settled by the laws of historical evidence, applied without prejudice or passion to the facts contained in contemporary chronicles, memoirs, and judicial records, with a due discrimination of their respective values. We must put altogether aside those imaginative sympathies which reject the severe truths of history. Believing as we do that truth is the only merit which gives dignity and worth to history, we look to it for a real picture of the rebellion of 1641 in colours that cannot deceive us. The subject is not of our seeking, but is forced upon us by the efforts of writers who are now trying to pervert the whole history of the relations between England and Ireland, so as to find in it new sources of exasperation to keep the two nations for ever apart. English writers have not, as a rule, been careful to vindicate the truth against fiction and im-

posture. Mr. Froude, who writes a preface to the work which is placed at the head of this article, says truly:—

‘The confidence with which the innocence of the Irish of any such crimes is now insisted upon has been the growth of time; of the unwillingness of the English to keep alive painful memories when they trusted and hoped it was needless to do so, because ancient enmities between classes and creeds and the two islands were fast dying out; and also of a consciousness on the part of the English that they have much to repent of in regard to Ireland, which has made them careless of defending themselves against particular charges.’

Yet, as he also remarks, the peculiarity of the case is, that the leading facts seem never to have been doubted or disputed for more than a century after the outbreak:—

‘The Irish Rebellion and Cromwell’s re-conquest were not done in a corner. Catholic Europe, with the Pope at its head, was deeply interested in the struggle and the issue of it. The barbarities of which the Irish were accused, and were said to have been found guilty, were published to the world, and, involving as they did the character of a Catholic nation, it might have been expected their publication would have drawn forth at once an indignant contradiction. Hundreds of exiles, who had been in Ireland at the beginning of the insurrection, were scattered over France, Spain, and Italy, and might have repudiated, had they been able, the tremendous accusation against their countrymen. They did nothing of the kind. Individuals among them here and there, after a lapse of years, asserted that they had no share in the massacres at Portadown, at Shrute, at Silver Mines, Portnaw, Macroom, and other places; but it never seems to have occurred to them to deny the general fact. And no writer of credit, Catholic or Protestant, who had lived through the rebellion, thought of denying it. Not only Temple, Borlase, and Clarendon, but the Catholics Clanricarde and Castlehaven, Father Walsh the Franciscan friar, Philip O’Reilly of Crom Castle, Mr. Kearney the Catholic brother of a Catholic bishop, with other Irish Catholic writers of the seventeenth century (whose narratives are hereafter printed for the first time from the Carte MSS.), all admit that massacres were committed, however they may venture to palliate or excuse those crimes. The Rev. Charles O’Connor, D.D., a highly respected Roman Catholic priest of the last century, made the same admission.’

This is a tolerably complete account of the evidence, to which we must add the thirty-two volumes of manuscript depositions in Trinity College, Dublin. We accept the whole, subject to the single qualification that both Protestant and Catholic writers, and especially such of them as mingled in the events they describe, reflect more or less the passions and prejudices, the partialities and animosities to be expected under the circumstances. This remark applies equally to Protestant writers like Temple and Borlase, and

to many of their Catholic contemporaries. Now in what way have later writers dealt with this mass of evidence? The earliest is Carte, the biographer of Ormonde, who had access to many original papers, now lost, which belonged to officers engaged in suppressing the rebellion. But Carte was bitterly anti-Puritan, and very favourable to the Roman Catholics because they were nominally fighting on the side of the Royalists. Leland, a Fellow of Dublin College, and author of a 'History of Ireland,' is, as Hallam says, a mere echo of Carte, but while hostile to the Presbyterians, he was less favourable than Carte to the Roman Catholics. Warner, another Dublin Fellow, wrote a 'History of the Irish 'Rebellion,' which merits the praise of Miss Hickson for 'its fairness and candour.' The Roman Catholics would have acted wisely to leave their cause in the hands of these three historians, but unhappily for themselves they assumed the responsibility of issuing a Roman Catholic version of the rebellion, which has done more than any other thing to discredit their character for veracity and candour. We refer to the work of Dr. John Curry, a Catholic physician of Dublin, which appeared about the time of the Irish Volunteers with the title of 'An Historical and Critical 'Review of the Civil Wars in Ireland.' It was published at a time when the Roman Catholics were anxious to dissipate the old historic prejudices which had their origin in the wars of the seventeenth century, and when the Protestants were almost equally anxious that the past should be forgotten. The author maintains that in 1641 there was nothing but a civil war in which the Irish fought for their lands and their religion, that there was no massacre, that the fiction of a massacre was invented by fraud and supported by perjured witnesses as a mere afterthought to justify the confiscation of the rebels' estates. There was massacre, no doubt, but it was done by the Protestants, and the innocent Catholics only took up arms in self-defence. Hallam justly stigmatises Curry's history 'as a tissue of 'misrepresentation and disingenuousness,' for it teaches the Irish Catholics to regard themselves as the victims of an atrocious conspiracy—a conspiracy to rob them of their lands and to justify it by blackening their reputation. Unhappily Curry has been almost implicitly followed for a hundred years past by nearly all Roman Catholic writers, and by a few Protestant writers of no great weight. The Catholic writers do not, as a rule, pretend to have investigated the history of the rebellion for themselves. They

merely repeat the statements of Curry and quote occasional concessions made by Protestant writers. We refer to the histories, sketches, or catechisms of Daniel O'Connell, who ignores the massacres altogether, and complains that the Catholics were 'accused of being the authors and perpetrators of assassinations and massacres of which they were only the victims'*—of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, who says that the soldiers in the Irish army 'never massacred 'one Protestant in cold blood'†—of Thomas D'Arcy Magee, Martin Haverty, and O'Neill Daunt, who hold that the Protestants were the first to begin the massacres by murdering three thousand Catholics in Island Magee—and of Mr. John P. Prendergast, who says: 'No murders were committed or even any man in arms killed by the rebels till 'late in December.'‡ The principal Protestant writers on the same side are Mr. J. T. Gilbert, the well-known Irish annalist,§ and the Rev. George Hill, a Unitarian minister.||

The whole question has been re-opened in recent times by Mr. Froude,¶ Mr. Lecky,** and Mr. Gardiner.†† We are all familiar with the strongly anti-Irish view taken by Mr. Froude of the transactions of the seventeenth century. Mr. Lecky discusses the question of the massacre in a chapter which is a masterpiece of historical criticism, though it fails, as we shall see, on several important points to do full justice to the facts in evidence. His position is that the rebellion did not begin with a general and premeditated massacre of the Protestants, but that murders and barbarities did occur on a very large scale, and that the Protestants were as fierce in their retaliation as the Catholics in their first attacks. His judgement, though very different from that of Dr. Curry, who denies the Catholic massacres altogether, is regarded as on the whole more favourable to the Catholic side than that of any previous historian. Mr. Gardiner substantially accepts the conclusion of Mr. Lecky. He puts a colour upon the rebellion and the massacres entirely at variance with the evidence.

It is at this point that Miss Hickson interposes with her

* Memoir on Ireland, Native and Saxon.

† Bird's-eye View of Irish History.

‡ Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland, p. 61.

§ Appendix to English Report of Historical MSS. Commission.

|| Historical Account of the Settlement of Ulster.

¶ English in Ireland.

** History of England in the Eighteenth Century.

†† Fall of the Monarchy of Charles I.

two volumes, containing 217 of the depositions taken before Royalist and Republican Commissioners, either in the years following the outbreak or after the civil war had been brought to an end by very stern treatment. The chief interest of her book consists in the publication of these documents, along with an historical and explanatory introduction, which enables us to understand their exact judicial value as well as the motives and causes of the rebellion, and the conduct of both English and Irish in the years that preceded and followed it. We are grateful to her for the contribution of many original documents, which serve to enlarge and correct the basis on which the history has hitherto been written. Though Mr. Froude describes her as something of a Nationalist, she is singularly free from prejudice; being about equally severe in her strictures upon Protestants and Catholics. In any case, she presents us with a large body of facts as the materials for our own independent judgement, quite regardless of the effects they may have upon the character or feelings of either Englishmen or Irishmen. She writes in a flowing and agreeable style, and her criticism of other writers is eminently temperate and fair.

The question under discussion cannot be properly understood without a right appreciation of the causes or motives of the rebellion. While some Protestant writers hold that it had no justification whatever, but merely revealed the passionate hatred which had consumed the Irish for generations, Catholic writers have spoiled their case by a needless exaggeration. They have always declared the two causes to be the confiscation of the estates of the Irish, and the persecution of the Catholic religion. Writers like Mr. Hill maintain that the Ulster plantation was 'the gigantic 'wrong' that sowed the dragon's teeth of rebellion, and the fact that the most widespread and cruel massacres occurred in Ulster might seem to countenance this view. But it is impossible in that case to understand the plan of the insurrectionary leaders, which was to drive out the English settlers but not to disturb the Scots, who were five times more numerous in Ulster than their English brethren. The Ulster plantation was not the greatest grievance of the Irish, because, as Mr. Lecky justly concedes: 'the assignment of a 'large part of Ulster to the native owners distinguished 'that plantation broadly and favourably from similar acts in 'previous times.' Of the two million acres confiscated to the Crown, one million and a half were actually given back to the natives, and though only sixty thousand acres of the

four hundred thousand reserved for planting purposes were assigned to Irish proprietors, the native peasants lived on among all classes of planters under a far better tenure than they ever possessed under their Irish chiefs.* Mr. Hill talks of the sufferings inflicted on the natives by their transplantation, but he himself assures us again and again that the Government could not carry out the plan of removing the natives because the English and Scotch settlers, though commanded to displace them and to settle their lands with their own countrymen, could not possibly dispense with the services of the Irish. The natives were not, as Mr. Hill says, universally settled upon inferior lands, because they had their portions among the settlers themselves for the greater security of the plantation, and Davies expressly mentions that they were removed 'in some places from the woods and 'mountains into the plains and open countries,' so as to be under the watchful eyes of the planters.

The fact is that the Ulster settlement affected the chiefs more than the peasantry, according to the favourite idea of Chichester, who, as Mr. Hill admits, 'had more regard for the 'large mass than for a few of high rank' (p. 127). The great wrong done to the peasantry was in the confiscation of the lands of the sept, under the plea that they belonged to the chiefs, but the Irish should recollect that it was the chiefs themselves who betrayed the peasantry by accepting from the English king those patents which made them owners in fee of the lands. Long, however, before the introduction of the English tenure, the position of 'the humblest clansman' was miserable in the extreme.† But in 1641 the peasantry were

* It is a mistake to suppose, with Mr. Hill, that the king confiscated the whole of six Ulster counties. Carte estimates the forfeited estates at 'above half a million of acres;' but Pynnar, who is the best authority on the subject, gives the estimate in the text, so that it is ridiculous for Nationalists to talk of the plantation as if it had displaced the whole native population of Ulster. As Ulster now contains nearly two millions of people, or almost one-third of the whole population of Ireland, there was surely room enough then for the six hundred thousand, of all races and creeds who peopled its plains and its mountains. Besides, in 1609 Ulster was almost without people, and in 1641, as Pynnar says, 'the fourth part of the land is not fully inhabited.'

† Mr. Herbert P. Hore, who is an authority on the Brehon laws, admits that 'if some of the Anglo-Irish squires of the last century 'rack-rented their tenants, an O'Bourke or an O'Flaherty of the sixteenth 'century literally flayed them alive'—the Irish saying of that day being, as Miss Hickson tells us, that such a chief 'was a cormorant over his

generally living under a good tenure—‘with a fixed estate’—upon a definite piece of land, and were freed from all the old Celtic exactions. It cannot be denied, however, that the introduction of a new people, all Protestants, into an ancient Catholic community was regarded by all classes of the Irish with undisguised dislike, and, therefore, we can the better understand the fiercely religious aspect of the war which ultimately broke out. It was not the Ulster plantation, but the project of new plantations in Connaught and Leinster which caused such a profound alarm in Ireland. It was the fear of further plantations that led the Irish to pay to Charles I. such large sums for the ‘graces’ which would have stopped them. But the idea of the rebellion had been hatched long before Strafford threatened Connaught with confiscation.* The insincerity of the king in the matter of the ‘graces’ no doubt gave a fresh incentive to rebellion, but they were conceded at last, and Carte tells us that they were actually in Dublin at the time of the outbreak awaiting the formal ratification of Parliament.

But it is impossible to doubt that the religious question had an even more potent influence than the agrarian in preparing the way for the insurrection. The view taken by all Catholic and most Protestant writers is that the Irish feared that the Parliament of England was about to extirpate popery in both kingdoms. Let us try to understand the exact truth concerning this matter. Miss Hickson emphasises the fact that the Catholics had never before been in such a favourable position, and that from 1628 till 1641 ‘the Roman Catholic Church, popularly supposed now-a-days to have been at that time depressed and proscribed, was on the contrary ‘virtually supreme.’ Sir John Bingley’s account of the two rival Churches in Ireland in 1628 settles this point. The Roman Catholic dignitaries and clergy ‘resided in the island, ‘taking all the tithes and dues of their office,’ while abbeys, nunneries, and religious houses were roofed and repaired all over the country. ‘The Dublin authorities once interfered for

‘clansmen’ (p. 5). She gives instances of natives preferring to live under the English planters, and remarks truly, ‘Let poetry and ‘romance, or the theories of enthusiastic Irish antiquaries, disguise ‘the facts as they may, it is certain that the old Irish clan system was ‘the paradise of the chief and the priest, the Brehon and the bard, ‘and the purgatory of the “humble clansman” ’ (p. 9).

* There was a plot to massacre all the settlers except three in 1615 (p. 22). An Irish friar said he had been fourteen years in preparing the 1641 rebellion (p. 194).

a moment to check the work of ecclesiastical organisation but soon again became passive. Miss Hickson therefore says :—

‘Roman Catholicism was virtually, though not ostensibly, supreme in Ireland in the spring and summer of 1641. The Roman Catholics had a majority in the army and in the Parliament; their bishops, priests, and friars were well supported by their flocks; every Catholic nobleman had his chaplain or confessor openly residing in his house. As more than one of those Roman Catholic noblemen and gentlemen confessed, when the fatal results of the rebellion began to make them repent of having ever embarked in it, their clergy in Ireland had no reasonable excuse for urging it on, much less for encouraging the people to extirpate the Protestants. A few Irish priests and friars and one bishop (Dease, of Meath) admitted this to be the truth; but they were a weak minority, hated and calumniated by the orthodox Romanists, whose object was not at all the mere remedying of Irish grievances, but the old grand object, dating from 1621 or 1605—the establishment of a Roman Catholic succession on the English throne, and the establishment of the supremacy of the Pope in both islands’ (p. 94).

But then it is objected by writers like Mr. Lecky, who is followed by Mr. Gardiner, that the old laws against popery were still in force, and that there was a general fear in Ireland about the time of the outbreak that they would be put into operation through the intense anti-Catholic zeal of the Puritan Parliament. More, one of the conspirators, told the Irish that ‘the Parliament now in England would suppress the ‘Catholic religion.’ That was precisely what More would say that he might inflame the people. Mr. Lecky lays great stress upon the persecuting threats of Puritan politicians in Parliament,* but these were inspired more by fear than by religious zeal, for Strafford was then plotting to raise an Irish army to ‘bring the English to a better mind,’ and the English people universally believed in a Catholic plot to extirpate Protestantism by force.† These threats were designed as a

* He quotes Sir John Clotworthy as saying that ‘the conversion of ‘the Papists in Ireland was only to be effected by the Bible in one ‘hand and the sword in the other.’ Reid says this was a Royalist calumny, and we believe it may be fairly classed among those reports of the most alarming character, some of them false and ‘exaggerated,’ which, Mr. Lecky himself says, ‘flew rapidly among the ‘Irish Catholics’ (p. 122).

† Mr. Gardiner says : ‘The conviction [of such a plot] was shared, ‘not merely by Pym and Hampden, who afterwards opposed the King, ‘but by Falkland and Capel, who afterwards supported him, and its ‘existence as a conscientious belief can alone explain the vehemence ‘of anger which it produced’ (vol ii. p. 12).

warning, but meant nothing so long as no action was taken by the conspirators. So far as Ireland was concerned the facts go clearly to show that no attempt was made by the English Parliament to interfere with religion till the first blow had been already struck by the Irish rebels. Mr. Lecky is right in saying that the defection of the Pale after the outbreak in Ulster was caused by the resolution of the English Parliament, in December 1641, not to tolerate the Catholic religion; but that very resolution, as Miss Hickson shows, was the consequence, not the cause, of the conflict having been already made a religious one by the Ulster rebels.* The conclusion to be drawn from the consideration of this whole matter, in the light of the depositions as well as of other evidence, is that religion was used by the conspirators, including both laymen and priests, as a pretext to justify the revolt, for Lord Castlehaven, a Catholic peer, frankly admits that 'it began most ' bloodily on the English in that kingdom, in a time of settled ' peace, without occasion given, and that the ecclesiastics ' took an effectual course, under a specious colour of religion, to add continually more fire to the burning coals.'†

* Yet Mr. Lecky thinks that a candid reader 'will be struck with ' the small amount of real religious fanaticism displayed by the Irish ' in the contest' (vol. ii. p. 167). This is a most extraordinary statement. We can well understand that he never read the depositions. In thirty-eight of them, the question of religion is uppermost. Seventeen of these—that is, nearly one-half—refer to the October days of 1641. But in what shape does the religious question present itself in these depositions? The Irish seem not so much apprehensive of persecution as resolved upon exterminating Protestantism in Ireland. They say 'they will not leave any Protestants in Ireland' (Deposition xxviii.); they pleaded 'the king's commission to do what they did, and that they were to extirpate or banish all the English and Protestants that would not become Roman Catholics' (Deposition lxxxii.). Lord Castleconnell, a Papist, told his aunt, Dame Barbara Brown, who was a Protestant, that she must go to mass, for that 'none but Papists must possess a foot of land again in Ireland' (Deposition clxxxiv.). The word was, 'Go to mass or be hanged' (Deposition civ.). A priest told a Protestant that 'if he remained a Protestant, he would not be allowed to live in Ireland' (Deposition clvi.). The Roman Catholic Bishop of Kilmore told Rector Creighton 'that their (Irish) commonwealth made a law that all that went not to mass should be sent out of the country.' We make no account of other depositions which speak of the burning of churches, or the murder of clergymen, or the destruction of Bibles, or the desecration of Protestant graves, or the refusal of burial to Protestants.

† *Memoirs*, vol. xiii. p. 22.

But after the war had actually broken out with the most savage ferocity, we have the uniform evidence of noblemen, gentlemen, farmers, soldiers, ministers, and tradesmen, that it became a '*bellum religiosum*,' in which, as we shall see, it was resolved to extirpate Protestantism out of Ireland.

We now come to the consideration of the depositions which tell the fearful story of the rebellion. It is no surprise to hear from Miss Hickson that 'for at least two centuries these depositions have been denounced by all Irish Roman Catholic historians, and by some English Protestant writers, as untrustworthy exaggerations, bearing internal evidence of their worthlessness, or else as deliberate wholesale perjuries, devised to bring about the confiscation of the lands of innocent men' (p. 121). Many of those who have pronounced this judgement upon them have never examined them for themselves. Neither Mr. Froude, who believes in their general truthfulness, nor Mr. Lecky, who seems to regard them with the distrust of Ormonde and Carte, has taken the pains even to look into them. Dr. Warner, who examined them about the middle of the last century, imagined that they presented the most obvious proofs of being nothing but parole evidence, and were, therefore, comparatively worthless. Mr. J. T. Gilbert, who was lately employed by the Historical Manuscripts Commission to report upon them, has declared them 'to be utterly untrustworthy and invalid on the face of them.' But when we know that his Report is largely composed of extracts from disingenuous National writers like Curry and Carey, not to speak of Mr. Prendergast who is bitterly hostile to the Cromwellians, we are not disposed to acquiesce in his judgement without an independent consideration of the facts. Mr. Froude has admirably summarised Miss Hickson's most satisfactory statement in defence of the depositions:—

'The cardinal objection urged against the depositions by Warner and Gilbert is that large portions of them—in some cases several pages—have had cancelling lines drawn across them by the pen of the official who wrote them, who thus made a tacit confession that much of the evidence was worthless. If this objection can be proved valid it is hardly necessary to say the controversy over the depositions is virtually at an end, and they may be set aside as of no authority. But Miss Hickson maintains that Gilbert and Warner's cardinal objection is based on a cardinal error on their part. Reid partly intimated as much long ago. Miss Hickson amends his intimation (*vide* pp. 128-132). She states, and the photograph she has had made by an eminent artist of one of the very depositions on which Mr. Gilbert bases his objection

unquestionably supports her statement (as does Mr. Waring's sworn evidence on Lord Muskerry's trial, at p. 199 of her second volume), that those lines which Warner and Gilbert have mistaken for cancelling lines are not really cancellings at all, but lines of abbreviation drawn over superfluous words and long inventories of stolen or lost goods, which the official copyist, employed to make transcripts of all that was important in the depositions for transmission to the King, was directed to omit. Miss Hickson points out that in no case have the lines been drawn over the words "*jurat coram nobis*" or over the "*jurat*" alone, which, either of them, standing intact above the signatures of the commissioners, stamp the deposition as sworn, any more than over the relations of murders or the names of rebels, and that those drawn over the superfluous tautology and inventories are made designedly light, so as to leave every word and cipher perfectly intelligible.

In a word, the official copyist, in preparing a copy of the depositions for the king and Parliament, gave in full all those parts which record murders and massacres, while he drew his light cancelling lines over those parts which recorded merely the loss of property. This discovery was made by Miss Hickson, who asks her readers to verify it for themselves by comparing the transcripts in the Harleian MSS. with the originals in Trinity College, Dublin.

The depositions having now been proved to be sworn, and not parole, evidence, the next question is, what are they worth as judicial testimony? Mr. Gilbert attempts to discredit them on various grounds, but Miss Hickson has triumphantly met all his objections. Most of the witnesses, he says, were persons in humble life, farmers, tradesmen, servants, and labourers. She replies that, though some of the gentry were murdered in a cruel and treacherous manner, 'the humble Protestants, farmers, yeomen, traders, artisans, and labourers, living with their families in small country towns or villages, or in lonely farmhouses, were the real sufferers by the rebellion.' She finds, besides, that the depositions of the gentry were more 'exaggerated and untruthful than those of the humbler class.' Mr. Gilbert thinks that because witnesses gave evidence of their losses in cattle, money, and clothes, as well as of the murder of relatives, their testimony ought to be received with suspicion. Miss Hickson replies that because the poor wife of a boycotted husband, killed by a party of 'Moonlighters,' claims compensation for the loss of her cows and her corn, her evidence as to his murder must not be rejected as worthless. To the frivolous objection that the interpreters of Irish-speaking witnesses might have misrepresented what

they swore, she answers that most of such witnesses were the poor Catholic Irish of Island Magee, whose relatives were murdered by the Protestants. Efforts have been made by Mr. Lecky, as well as by Mr. Gilbert, to discredit the evidence on account of the stories of apparitions haunting Portadown river and other scenes of massacre. But these stories originated with the Roman Catholics and not with the Protestants, and are no more inconsistent with the veracity of testimony as to facts of another kind, than is the testimony of the modern Irish who believe in the apparitions at Knock Chapel.* Other objections are disposed of with equal effectiveness by Miss Hickson. It cannot be denied, however, that, as several writers remark, some portions of the depositions, and especially those taken before the Royal Commissioners, who were clergymen and magistrates, represent mere hearsay evidence; but the objection can hardly be said to apply at all to the depositions taken before the Cromwellian Commissioners, who took pains to sift the evidence according to the strict rules of law. Miss Hickson is careful to point out the defects of individual depositions in her notes, correcting these either from other depositions or from documents of a different class. We have noted seven instances of this sort. But even in the case of such doubtful depositions, the witnesses are supported by the testimony of other witnesses—there being sometimes a dozen witnesses to a single transaction—while the depositions are further confirmed in essential points by Catholic versions of the massacres, like that of Kearney, and by private sources. Many of the witnesses were the widows or other relatives of the slain. Many of the witnesses, too, were Irish as well as English and Scotch, and many of the depositions bear the frankest testimony to instances of individual humanity and kindness on the part of priests, friars, and Catholic laymen of high and low degree. Miss Hickson may, therefore, well say ‘that the truthfulness of the Protestant witnesses, who are so careful to record the good as well as the bad treatment they met with, cannot be doubted.’ We may fairly admit that there are many exaggerations in the depositions, but it is quite inconceivable that the two

* Mr. Sanford, quoted by Mr. Gardiner (vol. ii. p. 313), says as to this ghost business: ‘Because the terrified witnesses deposed to having seen this, we are therefore to believe that no massacres took place, as if the very fact of their imagination being wrought up to fancying such sights were not the strongest proof that some horrible deed had been perpetrated in their presence.’

hundred and seventeen witnesses who make them should all have been perjured liars.* The depositions are now for the first time, with the exception of about a dozen, printed in full, for writers like Borlase and Temple merely published brief abstracts of many of them, which were often garbled to serve a purpose. Miss Hickson presents them, not in a chronological but in a topical order, printing together all such depositions as bear upon an individual massacre, those taken in 1652-4 appearing side by side with those taken in 1641-5, for the Cromwellian Commissioners investigated each massacre separately, producing in court the depositions of 1641-5, either re-examining the original witnesses, or, in case of their death, examining their surviving relatives so as to test the truth of the original depositions.†

The rebellion broke out on Saturday, October 23, 1641, the time being selected so near to the winter as to prevent the English from coming readily to the relief of their distressed countrymen. The rebels knew that the colonists were unarmed, because Strafford had two years before disarmed the Scots and the Puritans generally throughout Ulster lest

* 'In estimating evidence it is necessary to balance probabilities, and the probability that the deponents were urged to over-estimate their case must not allow us to forget the extreme improbability of such numbers of persons concurring in uttering unmitigated falsehood, though there was doubtless a good deal of exaggeration. Most of the depositions, too, have a truthful look, which is worth more when the evidence comes from a large number of deponents than when "it comes from one who may possibly be a skilful impostor."'—Letter of Mr. Gardiner in 'Academy,' August 23, 1884.

† It is a curious oversight on the part of Mr. Lecky, who discredits these depositions without having read them, that he should refer to Dean Jones's Report 'as the most trustworthy we possess on the subject to which it refers,' forgetful of the fact that this Report is wholly based upon the depositions (vol. ii. p. 142). It contains only forty depositions, and they refer chiefly to the counties of Monaghan and Armagh. Mr. Lecky says ('Academy,' August 23, 1884), 'The Trinity College depositions are accounts of these murders spread over the whole period of the war.' This is quite a mistake. They principally cover the first months of the rebellion. One hundred and fifty of the two hundred odd printed by Miss Hickson refer to the four months dating from the outbreak in October. Forty-six refer to October alone; nineteen to November; twenty-five to December; thirty-two to January; nineteen to February. Mr. Lecky hints that many of the narratives 'were drawn up many years after the events to which they refer.' This is also a mistake. Most of them were taken in 1641 and 1642; and the ninety-four taken in 1652-54 only confirm these earlier narratives.

they should assist Scotland in its quarrel with the king. Thus the Protestants were, through the policy of Charles I. and his Minister, left completely at the mercy of the Irish. They were besides, as Miss Hickson says, 'utterly unsuspecting and full of confidence in the goodwill of their Roman Catholic neighbours, whose religion was now virtually supreme or at the very least openly tolerated, and who, in another month, had they remained quiet, would probably have seen the laws passed which were to secure them in their estates, now covering fully two-thirds of the whole island.' The depositions throw but little light upon the secret plans of the leading conspirators; indeed, we may say, with Miss Hickson, that 'the innermost springs of the conspiracy remain a mystery to this day and are likely to remain so.' But there is no want of evidence that their plan was first to seize all the castles and strongholds in a single day by a sudden surprise, to drive out the English with as little bloodshed as possible, but to leave the Scots—at least, in the first instance—unmolested in their thriving settlements. The question, however, is not concerning the plans of the leaders. It is always tacitly assumed that there was but one common plan of insurrection, from which the old Irish of Ulster unhappily swerved, though for that matter the leaders must have known, as Mr. Froude significantly observes, that 'an Irish mob let loose upon defenceless enemies might be left to their own discretion in such a matter.' The people who were to join in the rebellion had a line of operations marked out for themselves, of which, perhaps, the leaders generally had no idea. Reid significantly remarks: 'The northern partisans concealed from their new and less violent associates the plans of spoliation they had been secretly maturing in conjunction with their expatriated relatives.'* It was no new project in Ulster. The idea of a massacre was long present to the Irish mind. Mr. Prendergast, who holds, as Miss Hickson says, that the Irish were 'too kindly-natured' to massacre in 1641, admits that in 1614 they had formed a conspiracy to massacre all the English in Ulster, except three persons. This is the 'sham-plot' of certain Irish writers, which 'a criminal gamester, named O'Lennan, was bribed by Chichester to invent.' But the

* Reid's 'History,' vol. i. p. 305. Charles I. had a grave responsibility in this matter. Mr. Gardiner says truly: 'In intriguing with the Catholic lords, Charles was applying a lighted match to a magazine of gunpowder' (vol. ii. p. 292).

publication of the Irish State Papers of 1614-25 proves that there were thirty-eight persons of high and low degree engaged in this conspiracy, whose depositions, along with that of the chief conspirator, lay bare its whole circumstances. The congress of priests and laymen in the Abbey of Multifarnham throws a vivid light upon the nature of the 1641 conspiracy. Some friars advised merely an expulsion of the English, similar to that of the Moors from Spain; others suggested a general slaughter; while others 'whose counsels, according to Dr. Jones, ultimately prevailed, were for a middle course, to spare the lives of such despoiled Protestants as might be employed to work for the Catholics, and might ultimately conform to their creed; but to put the rest to death.* This meant a general slaughter. Mr. Gardiner may safely say, 'It was evident that before all was over there would be wild work in Ireland.' And the depositions, as we shall presently see, prove that death or banishment was to be the fate of every Protestant who refused to conform to Catholicism.† Now upon two points the depositions are perfectly decisive: first, that the massacres began on the very day of the rising, though they did not reach their most appalling atrocity till some time afterwards; and, secondly, that the rebellion assumed from the very beginning the aspect, if not the dimensions, of a religious war.‡

* Hickson, p. 106.

† The design of the Irish was simply to have the country to themselves; for, according to Deposition cxxv., 'they would not leave an Englishman dwelling in the land,' and, according to Deposition cii., 'neither Scotch nor English were to live in Ireland.' How was this idea to be carried out? If the English departed quietly, there would be no massacre; but as resistance was certain, it must be effectively overcome. The rebels gave notice 'for all the English to depart or suffer instant death or perpetual imprisonment' (Deposition lxxxv.). 'They made a proclamation that all Englishmen and women that did not depart the country should be hanged, drawn, and quartered in twenty-four hours' (Deposition cxxxix.) Yet banishment could have been averted upon one condition. There was no objection to Englishmen as Englishmen, but to Englishmen as Protestants. We shall see that by going to mass the English could have saved their lives and their property.

‡ Mr. Lecky is very confident in affirming that 'the popular story of a general, organised, and premeditated massacre is entirely untrue.' He admits that 'murders occurred on a large scale with appalling frequency, and often with atrocious circumstances of aggravation,' and that 'it is quite possible that in some parishes or districts they may have assumed the magnitude of a general massacre'

As to the time of the outbreak, Dr. Warner, who minimises the proportions of the massacre, says that the widow of a magistrate in the county of Monaghan swore that the rebels killed her husband and thirty-two other persons on the fatal Saturday.* Rory M'Mahon hanged not less than eighteen persons on the church gate of Clones, and then set fire to the edifice on the same day. Honora Beamond, of Clones, says she saw the corpses of sixteen Protestants, 'nearly 'all women and children,' near the common mill.† Fifteen English Protestants were murdered in one parish of Fermanagh.‡ On the same day the Maguires of Fermanagh murdered Mr. Champion and six of his friends, at his own gate.§ But we have further evidence in a rather unlooked-for quarter. The Rev. G. Hill, who maintains there was no massacre at the beginning, himself draws attention to a passage in the Montgomery MSS. (p. 407), of which he says: 'This curious and 'important passage of the Montgomery MSS. proves that 'Protestants had been massacred in Tyrone on the very first 'day of the lamentable outbreak.' Reid publishes in his History an extract from a paper entitled, 'State of the 'County of Antrim in 1641, 1642' (in the Rawdon Collec-

(vol. ii. pp. 138-9). But he is convinced that there was no organisation or premeditation in the matter. We admit there was 'no general massacre'—Miss Hickson, on the authority of the depositions, making the same statement—because, sudden as was the attack in Ulster, many of the Protestants succeeded in escaping to the fortified towns. Nobody says the Protestants were all killed. But because all the English settlers were not killed on the first day, it does not follow that there was no organised or designed massacre, for the depositions prove that it was a religious even more than an agrarian war, and there was nothing for the settlers but death, conformity, or exile. The fact that all who fell into the rebels' hands were not killed, does not prove there was no massacre. Many Protestants were spared for various reasons. The rebels could not do without the skilled labour of some—'the carpenters, smiths, and forge-men of Sir Thomas Staples' ironworks' (Deposition lxxiii.), and those who could make shoes and hats for them (Deposition clxviii.), and those who could perform menial tasks. Some Protestants were spared through fear of reprisals (Deposition lxxxi.), the rebels expecting to be pardoned for their clemency; others, for exchange of prisoners or for ransom (Hickson ii. p. 356). The seizure of the fortified places was the first step in the enterprise, so as to secure the safety of the murderers in carrying out their designs; but they could not wait till the strongholds were taken—the massacres began on the very day of the rising.

* Warner's 'History of the Rebellion,' p. 72.

† Borlase, p. 57. Deposition xvi.

‡ Somers' Tracts, vol. v. p. 610.

§ Deposition iii.

tion).* ‘On October 23, 1641, and within a few days after, ‘the Irish rebels made slaughter of all men, women, and ‘children, which they could lay hands on within the county ‘of Antrim that were Protestants, burning their houses and ‘corn.’ Take the second day after the outbreak. The rebels cut the throat of Margaret Larmenie’s husband, at Clounish, county Fermanagh, and then murdered fourteen other Protestants in the same place.† Maguire, a chief of the conspirators, murdered at least a hundred persons in a single district.‡ It seems hardly possible to fix the day of the massacre at Portadown, when ninety persons according to some, a hundred and fifty according to others, were drowned in the deep water under the bridge. Some say it occurred on October 24, but this must be a mistake. Miss Hickson, depending upon Deposition xii., says it took place about All-Hallows, or, at furthest, between that time and November 23. It is unnecessary to go further in settling the time of the outbreak of the massacres, which went on continuously from day to day, till the first serious check given to the rebels in the open field led them to murder on a more stupendous scale.

It is only right, however, to notice the evidence which Curry, Lecky, Prendergast, and all Catholic writers adduce to prove that there was no massacre at the beginning. They maintain that the evidence already supplied is entirely inconsistent with the official documents of the period issued by the Lords Justices and others. The Lords Justices, in writing to the Lord Lieutenant in England on October 25, two days after the outbreak, make no allusions to murders; old Lord Chichester writes from Belfast on October 24 that ‘up till that date the rebels had killed only one man,’ and the Dublin Council appointed a commission in December 1641 to inquire into the losses of the settlers by plunder, and because nothing was said of massacres, therefore there were none. It is sufficient to say that the distance of Dublin from the scenes of massacre already described, as well as the fact that many parts of the country were already in the hands of the rebels, who would naturally stop all communication with the capital, made it impossible that the Lords Justices should immediately know of the murders. But what is the purport of their communications to England as soon as authentic tidings had reached them? Nine days after the outbreak—that is, on November 2—they

* Reid, i. p. 304.

† Deposition ii.

‡ Warner, p. 72.

declare that 'many disloyal and malignant persons . . . have most inhumanly made destruction and devastation of the persons and estates of divers of his Majesty's good and loyal subjects . . . and taken and slain and imprisoned great numbers of them.' Three days after, they say that the rebels 'had already slain many most barbarously, hewed some to pieces, and exposed thousands to want and beggary who had good estates and lived plentifully.'* They say in a letter to the Speaker of the House of Commons of the same date: 'This kingdom and the lives of us all here, and all the Protestants in the kingdom, were never in so great danger to be lost as at this moment, no age having produced in this kingdom an example of so much mischief done in so short a time, as now we find acted in less than a fortnight's space by killing and destroying of so many English and Protestants in several parts, by robbing and spoiling of them and many thousands more of his Majesty's good subjects.'† It is true that a commission was appointed on December 23 to examine into the losses of the Protestants, but on December 1, the Dublin Council tells the Long Parliament that 40,000 rebels were then in the field, putting to the sword men, women, and children who were Protestants—ill-using the women and dashing out the brains of the children before the parents' faces. Another commission, however, was appointed on April 6, 1642, to investigate the massacres in Ulster. There is nothing in the facts to imply that there were no massacres from the very beginning of the outbreak, and if the one commission was appointed before the other, it was because robbery was universal and massacre was not. The worst massacres occurred in the first four months. The inquiry came naturally at the end of this period.

Miss Hickson is therefore fully justified in saying: 'Those who believe that a general massacre of all the Protestants of Ireland began on October 23, and those who believe that no massacres took place in Ulster until December or January, will find no support in the depositions' (p. 141).

Let us now ascertain from these documents the details of some of these massacres, with their horrible or their shameful incidents as they are supplied to us by eye-witnesses.

They were almost always preceded or accompanied by robbery and spoliation. Every deposition with a few excep-

* Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 410.

† Nalson, vol. ii. p. 893.

tions begins with its narrative of losses in money, or cattle, or lands, or houses, or books. The good Bishop Bedell was robbed of 4,040*l.*, the gentry lost their thousands of pounds, the traders and yeomen their hundreds. Another almost invariable incident of the massacres was the stripping of the victims naked to the very skin, and in cases where their lives were immediately spared this humiliating incident often entailed death by exposure in one of the most inclement winters of the century.

‘And further saith that this deponent, and divers other Protestants, and among them [illegible] widows, after they were all robbed, were also stripped naked, and then, they covering themselves in a house with straw, the rebels then and there lighted the straw with fire and threw it amongst them on purpose to burn them, when they had been all burnt or smothered but that some of the rebels, more pitiful than the rest, commanded these crueller rebels to forbear, so as they did; yet the rebels kept them (the English) naked in a wild wood from Tuesday till Saturday in frost and snow; the snow unmelted lay long on some of them so as their children died in their arms.’*

‘And further saith that the said rebels stripped this deponent, his wife, and three small children of all their clothes.’†

‘And saith that although this deponent and the said Captain Smith’s wife escaped away and lived, yet the rest, being in all about a hundred and forty, being turned out without their clothes, died of hunger or starving.’ ‘She heard some one of the cruel rebel soldiers then and there boast and brag of the brave sport he and others had in setting on fire the straw which a stripped Englishwoman had tied about her, and how bravely he said “the fire made the English jade wince.”’‡

‘Deposeth that one Dogherty, a colonel of rebels, with others his soldiers and partakers, stripped at one time three hundred Protestants about Loughgall of their clothes, and then drove them like sheep into the church of Loughgall’—[they then murdered a hundred of them]—‘and this deponent so wounded, and many others so severely wounded, were turned out of the church, and were suffered to go up and down the country naked, to taste of the cold and sorrowful charity of the usurping, merciless, and pitiless Irish.’§

But these shameful and often fatal incidents pale before the narratives of murder inflicted by the rebels with every variety of fiendish inalignity. The Protestants were hanged, or shot, or stabbed, or drowned, or roasted alive, or even buried alive, if we can believe six depositions. Let us take

* Deposition of Magdalen Redmain, King’s county, vol. ii. p. 68.

† Deposition of Charles Shorter, of county Fermanagh, vol. i. p. 174.

‡ Deposition of Julian Johnson, widow of a Galway rector, vol. ii. p. 15.

§ Deposition of Alice Gregg, county Armagh, vol. ii. p. 91.

the Portadown massacre, which is attested by five graphic depositions. Neither Protestant nor Catholic denies the facts. The first witness, Elizabeth Price, was imprisoned in the church of Armagh with her five children and 'three-score more Protestants,' and seems to have been kept in prison while her children were sent off to be drowned at Portadown. She could not have seen the massacre herself, but, as she is fully corroborated by eyewitnesses, we publish her testimony on account of its graphic details:—

'But as to this deponent's five children and about forty more young and poor prisoners, these were sent away with passes from Sir Phelim, together with about threescore and fifteen more Protestants from other places within the parishes of Armagh and Loughgall, who were all promised they would be safely conveyed and sent over to their friends in England; their commander or conductor for that purpose being, as he afterwards proved to be, a most bloody and accursed rebel, by name Captain Manus O'Cane, and his soldiers having brought—or, rather, driven like sheep or beasts to a market—these poor prisoners, being about a hundred and fifteen, to the bridge of Portadown, the said captain and rebels then and there forced and drove all these prisoners, and amongst them this deponent's five children, by name Adam, John, Anne, Mary, and Jane Price, off the bridge into the water, and then and there instantly and most barbarously drowned the most of them, and those that could swim, and came to the shore, they knocked on the head, and so after drowned them, or else shot them to death in the water.'*

'And upon the way there [to Portadown] they [the rebels] killed Mr. William Fullarton, the minister of the said parish, and another gentleman, Mr. Richard Gladwith; and such English as they met they did take them along with them, so that they were in all about a hundred prisoners at their coming to Portadown, where they were all drowned except this examinant and William Taylor and George Morrice. And several of them striving to swim out, when they came near the land the Irish did either shoot or knock them down with the oars of their boats.'†

The Corbridge massacres in county Monaghan are attested by Alexander Crichton: 'And the next morning after that 'murder the rebels murdered forty-six English at Corbridge 'aforesaid, when this deponent, notwithstanding escaping 'with his life, was admitted to go to Sir Phelim O'Neil, who 'gave him a protection for himself, his wife, and his child.'‡ Sixteen other Protestants were murdered on the way to Corbridge on the same day.

Then there were the wholesale massacres in three parishes

* Deposition of Elizabeth Price, county Armagh, vol. i. p. 177.

† Deposition of William Clark, vol. i. p. 184. ‡ Vol. i. p. 189.

by Sir Phelim O'Neill's order after his defeat at the siege of Augher:—

‘In revenge whereof the grand rebel, Sir Phelim O'Neill, Knt., gave direction and warrant to one Maolmurry M'Donnell, a most cruel and merciless rebel, to kill all the English and Scottish men within the three parishes aforesaid; whereupon that bloody rebel, with his soldiers, most cruelly murdered within a musket-shot of this deponent's house twenty-seven men of Scottish and English Protestants, and left them lying there,' where deponent buried them. . . . ‘And those wicked rebellious murderers, about six weeks after, gathered all the Protestants, men, women, and children, together of these three parishes, by sevenscore or eightscore at a time, and forced and drew them away from thence into the county of Down, and there drowned them in a lough near Loughbricklan, and at a place called Scarvagh, and other places thereabouts.’ *

The account of the Silver Mines massacre in Tipperary given in the depositions is confirmed, except as to the number of the victims, by one of the Catholic correspondents of the Duke of Ormonde. Anne Sherring deposes to the murder of thirty-two Protestants, including her husband, ten women, and four children. Thunder and lightning burst forth during the time of the massacre, and seemed for a moment to terrify the rebels:—

‘Yet it restrained them not, but they persisted in their bloody acts till they had murdered her husband and the rest of these Protestants, and had hacked, hewed, slashed, stabbed, and so massacred them that they were all cut to pieces, her husband, for his part, having thirty grievous wounds then and there given him, some near or through his heart, some mortal wounds in his head, some in his belly, and in either arm four wounds, and the rest in his back, legs, thighs, and neck. And that murder done, these barbarous rebels tied withes about the necks of those murdered, and drew them out of the refining mill, where they slew them, and threw them all, or most of them, into a deep hole, formerly made, one upon another, so that none of these men, women, and children escaped death.’ (Vol. ii. p. 37.)

The Catholic account says that the rebels ‘massacred ‘sixteen honest and civil miners and refiners hired at work ‘at the Silver Mines.’ † Though well-known, they were never punished; but, as this writer observes, ‘by the just judgment of God they all came to very sad ends.’

The Shrulle massacre in county Mayo was one of the many treacherous affairs that marked the whole progress of the civil war. Convoys were only traps to betray the Protestants

* Deposition of James Shaw, county Armagh, vol. i. p. 197.

† Vol. ii. p. 251.

into the hands of assassins. A party of sixty-three Protestants, including the Bishop of Killala, the dean and six other clergymen, were, according to the evidence of the dean's widow, being conveyed by Lord Mayo from Castlebar to Galway, but, by means of an ambush set by his lordship himself and his son at Shrule Bridge, all the men, except the bishop and two others, were murdered, as well as several women.

'And this deponent, then going into the town, did see the Englishmen and the women forced over the bridge, who made a great cry. This deponent, drawing nearer to the bridge, did see divers of the said English murdered—some with clubs knocking them down, others shooting at them, others running them through with swords and stabbing them with skeans.'*

The Catholic account reduces the victims to thirty, and represents Edward Atlea, or Burke, as the plotter of the murders, but the High Court of Justice executed the son of Lord Mayo ten years afterwards for the crime, his father having meanwhile escaped punishment by death.

The Belturbet massacre is tersely described in the deposition of William Gibbs, of Belturbet:—

'And then and there, viz. about the 30th January, 1641, those rebels took about thirty-four British Protestants, men, women, and children, and drowned them in the river at Belturbet, after which time the plenty of fish formerly in that river went away.' (Vol. i. p. 305.)

The Rev. Robert Maxwell, rector of Tynan, county Armagh, whose depositions contain far too much hearsay evidence, testifies, however, of his own knowledge that fifty-six men, women, and children, were taken out of his own house and drowned at one time.†

The Kinard massacres are attested by William Skelton, a servant of Sir Phelim O'Neill, who deposes in addition to many other shocking murders, that 'afterwards about Easter following about fifty-five persons of English and Scotch, all tenants of the said Sir Phelim O'Neil, and dwelling in Kinard and thereabouts, were driven together in a flock to the waterside at Kinard and there drowned.'‡

The Portnaw massacre is memorable on account of its connexion with the retaliatory Protestant massacres of Island Magee. It occurred on January 2, 1642. The Macdonnells of Antrim surprised a British detachment of soldiers at Portnaw, on the Bann, and slew them by treachery, and afterwards murdered a great many old men, women, and

* Deposition of John Hussie, vol. i. p. 397.

† Vol. i. p. 338.

‡ Vol. i. p. 205.

children in the neighbouring district. James M'Connell, of Ballymena, who was made prisoner by the Macdonnells, deposes that he 'saw lie dead on the way as he returned, at least a hundred men, women, and children of the British, who had been murdered the day before, and that he believes that many were killed on both sides the way as they returned.* The facts are without dispute. Now, the Island Magee massacre occurred on January 7, five days after the Portnaw affair. We have twenty depositions concerning the murder of the thirty Catholic Irish of this place, which was committed by a party of Scotch Protestants from Carrickfergus. Miss Hickson gives great space to this transaction, with the view of showing the perfect impartiality of the Cromwellian commissioners.

There were many other massacres in all the four provinces, those in Cashel, Killarney, Coole, Clones, and Longford being events of peculiarly deliberate wickedness. Unhappily there were two classes of people who imparted to these scenes a character of special ferocity. We refer to the priests and the women. A few extracts from the depositions must suffice :—

'Three more Protestants were hanged at several times by Hugh M. Maguire aforesaid, a priest (who afterwards caused many others to be hanged, and would tell the rebels he would pardon and forgive them for killing heretics, meaning the Protestants, calling them "English dogs"), and by some of the Maguires, M'Cabes, and M'Mahons.'†

'And saith that Paul O'Molloy, a friar, was the principal man in that slaughter and robbery [in county Galway], who quickly after that skirmish in a triumphant rejoicing said, "It was brave sport" to see the young men, meaning the young Englishmen then slain, defending themselves, "their eyes burning in their heads."‡

'And one friar John, who was one of the principal murderers, took hold of his hands and leg while he was hanging, saying, "Go, tell the devil I sent thee to him for a token."§

'This deponent, by or by means of Nicholas French, and other priests and friars, then was put in prison in a most dark, odious, loathsome dungeon, and 'this deponent did still observe that the Romish priests and friars did frequently in their sermons, and in other ways, persuade the rest of the Romish faction to extirpate and root out all the Protestants of the kingdom.¶

* Vol. i. p. 241.

† Deposition of Robert Flack, Fermanagh, vol. i. p. 222.

‡ Deposition of Julian Johnson, a minister's widow of county Galway, vol. ii. p. 14.

§ Deposition of Denny Montgomery, a minister's widow, vol. ii. p. 28.

¶ Deposition of Donatus O'Connor, county Wexford, vol. ii. p. 47.

The Irishwomen, and even the very children, shared in the bloody ferocities of the time:—

‘And this deponent hath observed that the rebellious Irishwomen were more fierce and cruel than the men, and their children to their powers exceeding fierce, inasmuch as she has seen the rebels’ children kill English men and women.’*

‘And further saith that about Candlemas 1642, a great number of Protestants were, by the means of one Jane Hampson, otherwise Hampson, formerly a Protestant, but a mere Irishwoman, and lately turned to mass, and of divers her assistants and confederates, forced and thrust into a thatched house within the parish of Kilmore aforesaid, and then and there, the Protestants being almost naked, only covered in part with rags formerly deserted by the Irish in the fields, the same house, by that cruel virago, Jane Hampson, and her barbarous assistants, was set on fire in several parts thereof, the poor imprisoned Protestants being by armed parties kept in the house, were miserably and barbarously burned to death.’†

Rose O'Reilly ‘was the chief cause and instigator of the ‘drowning of fifty Protestants—men, women, and children—‘at one time, at the bridge of Belturbet.’‡

It is more agreeable to our feelings to turn aside from these dreary chronicles of bloodshed and notice the many instances of humanity displayed by the Irish people of all sorts. One Neal McCannan protected Dean Bartley and fifty or sixty English and Scots for three quarters of a year, though Sir Phelim O'Neill had commanded their slaughter.§ The Rev. Thomas Johnson testifies to the humanity of Lord Clanricard:—

‘Colonel Plunket treated us with a great deal of humanity, and in like manner did Friar Malone at Skerry; only this besides his rebellion was condemnable in him, that he took the poor men’s Bibles that he found in the boat, and cut them in pieces, and cast them into the fire, with these words, that he would deal in like manner with all Protestant and Puritan Bibles.’||

‘But he spoke in high terms of the kindness shown to him by Captain Tirlogh Molloy and John M'Tarrell, gent., of Ballycarry, in the Queen’s county, saying that he (this deponent) is confident that the said Molloy and M'Tarrell were much grieved at the ill treating of the English, which appeared not only the said Molloy’s and M'Tarrell’s

* Deposition of Mrs. Price, vol. i. p. 182.

† Deposition of Joan Constable, county Armagh, confirmed by that of Anne Smith, who escaped out of the burning house, vol. i. p. 290.

‡ Deposition of Marmaduke Batemanson, gent., county Cavan, vol. i. p. 307.

§ Vol. ii. p. 36.

|| Deposition of Rev. John Kerdill, near Dungannon, vol. i. p. 194.

loving words, but by the real courtesies they did the English at divers times.*

One witness testifies to the efforts of a Coleraine friar to have a soldier punished by Sir Phelim O'Neill for murdering an English Protestant;† another to the kindness of 'a priest, called O'Donnelly, who saved his life, to cut wood, make fires, and keep his cows for about a year and a half;‡ another to the indignation of a dignitary priest, named O'Corr, at the murder of a mother and her child, saying that 'that child cried for vengeance against them, and that corn or grass would not grow nor anything prosper where they did any of those bloody acts.'§ Miss Hickson is therefore amply justified in her observation upon incidents of this humane character:—

'We have seen how careful the deponents generally were to mention the names of any Roman Catholic, from Owen O'Neill down to a poor labourer, layman, or priest, who had done them a kindness, and the letters, orders, &c., hereafter given, written in 1650-55, exempting from transplantation and forfeiture John Knight of Kerry, John O'Connell, Dan. O'Hagan, and other Roman Catholics, who had been real, not pretended, friends of the persecuted Protestants in 1641-9, will show that such good deeds were always rewarded by Cromwell. Even Roman Catholic historians are obliged to admit that he rewarded the two priests who saved the lives of a few Protestants in the massacre at Cashel—a massacre which drew down on that place the terrible vengeance of Murrough O'Brien, fourth Baron of Inchiquin. (Vol. ii. p. 158.)

There cannot be the least doubt in any unprejudiced mind that the depositions which record the sayings of the rebels themselves as a whole represent the war as more religious than agrarian in its origin and design. Ranke, in his 'History of England,' says, with his usual judicial gravity, that in Ireland 'the motives of the Sicilian Vespers and of the night of St. Bartholomew were united; religious abhorrence entered into a dreadful league with the fury of national hatred.'|| But it was the religious motive that gave to the rebellion in Ireland such a fiercely malignant aspect. The weight of Celtic anger fell upon the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, of whom, as Reid tells us, no less than thirty were murdered in one part of Ulster. The Catholics could not forget in the day of their power 'the abuses of the

* Deposition of Ralph Walmsley, near Birr, vol. ii. p. 85. ;

† Vol. i. p. 228. ‡ Vol. i. p. 287. § Vol. i. p. 294.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 287 (Oxford translation).

‘Church-courts and the exorbitant exactions of the Established clergy.’ But the depositions show that none but Protestants were henceforth to be allowed to live in Ireland. Sir Phelim O’Neill told Lady Strabane early in the struggle, ‘that he would never leave off the work he had begun until mass should be said or sung in every church in Ireland, and that a Protestant should not live in Ireland be he of what nation he would.’* Barnaby Dunne, of Queen’s county, Esquire, testified that his servant, Iregan MacRory Dunne, confessed to him that ‘there was no safety for the life of deponent or his wife in Iregan, unless they went to mass;’ and one Friar Conn tried in vain to convert him to Popery, and asked him to sign a document which implied his joining ‘the confederation for banishing the English that would not conform to the Roman Catholic religion.’†

‘And a poor Englishman, called Toby Emmet, being by the rebels drawn to go to the mass, was, on the same day of his reconciliation, returning homeward, hanged, the rebels themselves saying they hanged the English after their reconciling to the Roman Church that they may pray for their souls.’‡

‘They [Nugent and the friar] told this examinant that if ever he intended to enjoy his estate, he must forsake his religion and turn Papist. But as examinant doth and will choose rather to live and die miserable in want, as now he doth, rather than to purchase his estate, if it had been a world, on such terms.’§

Jasper Horsey tells of one Donogh MacIregan, an Irish Protestant, whom fifteen priests and friars at various times tried to convert to Popery. ‘At last, when they could not draw him, they gave him his choice to turn Papist and save his life, or else there was no remedy, he must be hanged; he told them he was persuaded in his conscience he was of a good and sound profession, and that he would not turn Papist while he lived.’|| They hanged him. The same witness testifies that a maid-servant, refusing to become a Papist, was first shot at and then hanged.¶

The rebels, if they are to be believed, reported to Alexander Crichton, gent., county Monaghan, that a Fermanagh priest named Maguire had reconciled forty or fifty Protestants to the Church, and ‘that thereupon he [the priest] presently told them they were in a good faith, and, for fear they

* Lodge, vol. v. p. 114.

† Vol. ii. p. 83.

‡ Deposition of John Nicholas Walsh, King’s county, vol. ii. p. 69.

§ Deposition of John Edgeworth, ancestor of Miss Edgeworth, the Irish novelist, vol. i. p. 361.

|| Vol. ii. p. 135.

¶ Vol. ii. p. 135.

‘should fall from it and turn heretics again, he and the rest that were with him cut all their throats.’* The fear of death seems to have effected many of these conversions. John Goldsmith, parson in county Mayo, deposes that ‘those of the laity who turned to mass did amount to a thousand in number in the county Mayo aforesaid; all the ministers save this deponent, some being fled, some murdered, and the rest turned to mass.’† John Hickman, county Armagh, witnesses that he and others were kept in a secure place for a year, ‘during which time the rebels sent them word, and threatened them with death if they would not go to mass.’‡ Stephen Love, of Killarney, testifies that eight English Protestants, whose names are given, ‘are since this rebellion turned Papists.’§ Robert Wadding, gent., of county Carlow, was brought to a priest to be reconciled, ‘where the priest of that parish, one Butler, was so busied in giving absolution to the poor English Protestant inhabitants thereabouts, that this deponent had to wait his leisure;’ but he declined to be reconciled, though assured by the priest that ‘there would be no living in this country for deponent, for no Protestants must abide therein.’||

It is unnecessary to proceed further with this most painful subject, except to estimate the extent of the slaughter. It seems quite impossible to form any exact judgment on the matter, for the original estimates on both sides greatly exaggerated the loss of life. Friar Walsh, an honest and loyal priest, said the number of the murdered might be about eight thousand. Dr. Warner was the first historian to minimise the extent of the massacres by representing the number of Protestants who lost their lives ‘out of war’ as twelve thousand, of whom four thousand were murdered. Mr. Gardiner holds that ‘the number of those slain in cold blood at the rebellion could hardly be much more than five or six thousand, whilst about twice that number may have perished from ill-treatment.’¶ Miss Hickson says: ‘It seems more

* Vol. i. p. 190.

† Vol. ii. p. 379.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 23.

§ Vol. ii. p. 106.

|| Vol. ii. p. 50.

¶ History of England, vol. x. p. 68, last ed. Mr. Gardiner has taken occasion to remark in a critical journal since the appearance of Miss Hickson’s book, that ‘Mountjoy’s deliberate starvation of Ulster was ‘morally worse than the spasmodic massacres or murders of 1641.’ Like Mr. Lecky, he seems to forget that Mountjoy was engaged in suppressing a rebellion supported by a Spanish invasion, and that, ruthless as was undoubtedly his treatment of the Irish, it was an act of war, while the massacres of 1641 were the result of a conspiracy for the

'likely that about twenty-seven thousand Protestants were murdered by the sword, gun, rope, drowning, &c., in the first three or four years of the rebellion.' * We are inclined to think the estimate much too high, but the lowest computation presents a fearful sacrifice of human life. It is very doubtful whether the victims of the French Reign of Terror amounted to anything like the more moderate of these estimates. Mr. Lecky may well say, 'The total at the smallest is very horrible.'

We must now briefly notice the terrible retribution that followed this long course of bloody fanaticism, and see how it influenced the character and destinies of the Irish people for whole generations. The first fact of moment is, that the temporary success of the rebellion opened the way to the bloody and distracted years (1642-9), in which the country was devastated from end to end. Mr. Gardiner speaks of 'the red mist of blood' which then settled down upon the country as it rushed onward to anarchy. The English power seemed for the time to be at an end. The great Catholic confederation was practically supreme, and had the destinies of the country in its hands. For the first time in history the Irish were united. The distinctions of race were lost; individual feuds were smothered; religion bound together the discordant elements; and the whole nation concentrated its strength in one desperate effort to assert at once its national independence and its Catholic exclusiveness.† Yet no sooner had the Irish people got the country effectually into their hands than the old divisions revived to distract all their counsels. The Anglo-Catholics of the Pale, who merely wanted a religious toleration, and the old Irish Catholics, who wanted an agrarian revolution as well, were at war during the eight years that preceded the conquest of Cromwell. The confederation of Kilkenny tried in vain to

extermination of peaceful settlers in the country. Mr. Lecky, while he says that 'the suppression of the native race in the wars against Shane O'Neill, Desmond, and Tyrone was carried on with a ferocity which surpassed that of Alva in the Netherlands' (vol. ii. p. 95), gives no hint of the fact that two popes had excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, and released her subjects from their allegiance, and that three Spanish descents had been made upon Ireland in her single reign. The efforts of Catholic writers to represent Elizabeth as actuated solely by a spirit of religious zeal is thoroughly exposed in the able work of Killen in his '*Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*' (1877).

* P. 163.

† Cox, vol. ii. p. 189; Leland, vol. iii. p. 310.

remove 'the causeless distrust,' but it was all too evident that the country had not the capacity or the patriotism to govern itself. The struggles of Royalists, Parliamentarians, Anglo-Norman Irish, and old Irish, involved an immense loss of life, and so exhausted the country that it had neither heart nor strength to resist the invasion of Cromwell.

The next step in the retribution was the invasion of Cromwell, which involved such a subjugation as Ireland had never known in all her history. The work of the Rev. Denis Murphy, which is placed at the head of this article, gives us a vivid picture of the miseries she endured during this period. Though not a work of much historic value, it is creditable to the diligence and research of the author, inasmuch as he has ransacked all printed collections and the large manuscript stores of information to be found in the seminaries and colleges of the Continent, including the Vatican itself, to illustrate the course of the great Puritan conqueror as he swept over Ireland in his brief nine months' campaign. The author is thoroughly Nationalist as well as Catholic in feeling, but he is on the whole singularly fair, with certain significant exceptions, to be presently noticed. Of course, he sees no retribution in the terrible chastisement inflicted by Cromwell, but only a war of extermination mainly prompted by religious fanaticism.*

* Mr. Murphy represents Cromwell as addressing his soldiers on their arrival in Dublin to the effect 'that no mercy should be shown 'to the Irish, and that they should be dealt with as the Canaanites in 'Joshua's time' (p. 78). This is a pure invention, for which there is no authority whatever. Mr. Murphy quotes two writers, but neither of them supports his statement. Macaulay, who is referred to as one authority, makes no reference whatever to such an address, though he does say for himself, in reference to the whole campaign, that Cromwell 'gave the rein to the fierce enthusiasm of his followers, waged war 'resembling that which Israel waged on the Canaanites, and smote the 'violators with the edge of the sword' ('History of England,' vol. i. p. 130). Anderson, who is the second authority, merely says, 'The 'native Irish were next punished by General Cromwell, who, they say, 'made his soldiers believe the Irish ought to be dealt with as the 'Canaanites in Joshua's time' ('Royal Genealogies,' p. 786). But he gives no authority for this mere rumour. In point of fact, it would have been worse than folly for Cromwell to make any such proclamation at the beginning of his campaign, for the threat of extermination would have made the Irish fight with all the energy of despair. Mr. Murphy's statement is, besides, quite inconsistent with the directions which Cromwell is admitted to have given in Dublin, forbidding his soldiers

All through the campaign, however, Cromwell declared that he came to avenge massacre: 'We are come to ask an account of the innocent blood that hath been shed'—as he said to the Catholic bishops and clergy in January 1650. 'You, unprovoked, put the English to the most unheard of and barbarous massacre (without respect of age or sex), that the sun ever beheld, and at a time when Ireland was in perfect peace' (pp. 413, 422). He told the Governor of Kilkenny that the Irish had been 'guilty of an unheard of massacre of the innocent English' (p. 297). The severities inflicted by Cromwell took the threefold form of war, judicial execution, and confiscation. There is nothing more remarkable in history than the ease with which Cromwell conquered Ireland. When we consider that the Irish soldiers were far more numerous than the English, that the country bristled with castles and places of strength, which were thoroughly equipped for defence, and that the Irish were fighting under skilled generals on behalf of their religion and their country, backed by all the sympathy of their own nation, the result is very disappointing. In fact, they never once encountered the English in a pitched battle. No doubt the terrible fate of Drogheda, together with the revolt of the Munster garrisons, which were held by Protestant Royalists, caused the speedy collapse of Irish resistance.* As Carlyle tersely says, 'it cut through the heart of the Irish war.' Mr. Murphy condemns, as he has a just right to do, the tremendous severities of the war, and especially the hard treatment of priests and women. The facts are unfortunately without dispute, though they may be slightly exaggerated in the correspondence of the exiled priests of

to plunder, and promising to protect the people 'so long as they behaved themselves peaceably and quietly,' and paid the contributions imposed by his army (p. 79).

* Mr. Murphy corrects the mistake of most historians in showing that the Drogheda garrison consisted almost wholly of Irish Catholics. This fact in itself explains the wholesale slaughter—'an act which,' as Cromwell frankly admits—'otherwise cannot but work regret and remorse.' Froude says that 'several regiments, almost wholly English, had been thrown into Drogheda under Sir Arthur Aston, late Governor of Reading' (vol. i. p. 123). Mr. Murphy thinks that Mr. Froude intends by this statement 'to extenuate Cromwell's cruelties to the Irish,' but the fact that the garrison was mainly Catholic only serves to explain the language of Cromwell, when he speaks of 'their death as a righteous punishment for having imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood.' The Essex MSS. at Stowe confirm the statement of Ormonde that the garrison was Catholic.

the Continent. But it would be quite impossible to understand the motive of the great Republican general from anything that appears in Mr. Murphy's book. Why should the Irish be treated with greater severity than the Scotch who were defeated soon after at Dunbar without the slaughter of either clergy or women? Was it not on account of their part in the massacres of 1641? Accordingly, as we are told by Mr. Murphy, 'where any places surrendered, the priests were always excepted from quarter.' Not exactly, for Cromwell told the Governor of Kilkenny that the priests would be untouched if the place should surrender, and the priests at Fethard were likewise spared. 'They were henceforth out of protection, to be treated as enemies that had not surrendered.' The well-known fact that the Irish had resolved to extirpate Protestantism* in Ireland explains the determination of Cromwell to destroy the whole organisation of the Catholic Church. Therefore the following passage from Mr. Murphy is very significant, as pointing out the ruin the clergy brought upon themselves and their Church by their crimes:—

'In the year 1649 there were in Ireland twenty-three bishops and four archbishops. In the cathedrals there were as usual canons and dignitaries. The parishes had pastors, a great number of priests, and numerous convents of regulars. But after Cromwell had attained to supreme power all were scattered. Over three hundred were put to death, one thousand were driven into exile; four bishops were slain, the others were obliged to fly to foreign countries, except the Bishop of Kilmore, who was too feeble to be removed (MS. in the Arundel Library, Stonyhurst). In 1641 there were in Ireland forty-three houses of the Dominican Order and six hundred religious. Ten years after there was not a single house in their possession, and three-fourths of the religious were either dead or in exile ("Hib. Dom.," p. 286).†

The horrors of war were succeeded by the more deliberate retribution inflicted by the civil tribunals. Cromwell was resolved to 'make inquisition for innocent blood,' and ac-

* The Irish confederation proscribed all Protestant worship wherever they had the power (Cox, vol. ii. p. 189; Leland, vol. iii. p. 310). See the depositions likewise. Even Mr. Gardiner is compelled to say, 'Whether under any circumstances an Irish National and Catholic Parliamentary Government would have been tolerant of existing Protestant congregations may reasonably be doubted.' (Vol. ii. p. 288.)

† Nobody will now justify the severities Cromwell exercised in war; but it is only fair to himself to quote his own words to the Catholic bishops: 'Give us one instance of one man since my coming to Ireland not in arms massacred, destroyed, or banished, concerning the massacre and destruction of whom justice hath not been done or endeavoured to be done' (p. 420).

cordingly appointed a High Court of Justice to try assassins by due course of law. Miss Hickson recently discovered a portion of the records of this court among the Stearne MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin, which she has published in her present work, with the view of showing the complete fairness of the Cromwellian judges. In opposition to Sir Charles G. Duffy's statement that 'the maddest evidence' was received by the judges 'against the Irish, while no witness 'was heard on their behalf,' Miss Hickson very fairly shows that 'the Cromwellian Commissioners took care to collect 'evidence against all murderers—English, Irish, and Scotch '—showing no favour or impartiality to any of them on 'account of his creed or nationality, or the worldly position 'or creed of his victims.' (Vol. ii. p. 206.) Carte, the Royalist historian, actually charged them with unduly favouring the Irish.

But a far more serious, because more enduring, retribution befell the Irish in the tremendous scheme of confiscation, by which Cromwell penned up the whole Catholic population within the single province of Connaught, and reserved the other three provinces for the purposes of English colonisation. The work failed as a substantive scheme, but it succeeded to a most fatal extent in alienating the lands of the Irish, for it was Cromwell, rather than Charles II., who fixed the disposition of property in Ireland nearly as it is at the present hour. For eight years the new settlement held its ground, changing everything, breaking up the old framework of Irish society, and replacing the Catholic nobility and gentry by a new Protestant proprietary of English blood. It is not wonderful that the name of Cromwell is still so hated in Ireland. What, then, had the Irish gained by their rebellion with its dreadful massacres? Instead of sweeping away the English settlers so as to recover the whole land for themselves, instead of exterminating Protestantism so as to make Ireland an exclusively Catholic country, the struggle ended in the loss of three-fourths of the land, in the firmer establishment of that Ulster plantation which has ever since rendered united political action among Irishmen impossible, and in the complete establishment of the Protestant religion. But the retribution did not end with the Cromwellian conquest. When an effort was made forty years later by the Irish to reverse these humiliating disasters on the field of battle, and to retaliate upon their enemies by an act of attainder passed in a Catholic Parliament, threatening nearly three thousand Protestant lives and

taking back the confiscated lands, the Williamite conquerors took steps to outlaw the whole nation by means of the Penal Laws. It was practically the last struggle of a proscribed creed and a conquered people. The old Celtic families were no more to hold their natural place among the ennobled houses of Great Britain. The Irish people, as a whole, sank down into listless penury. The victory of the Williamites was so complete that there might have been room for the adoption of a generous policy to heal the wounds of a bleeding nation. But a great opportunity was lost. The Penal Laws were allowed to hold the country in their grasp for eighty years, and even after the union with Great Britain the old historic prejudice, dating from the wars of the seventeenth century, still survived in the Protestant mind to bar for a whole generation the concession of political rights to the Roman Catholics.

Unhappily for the peace of Ireland, the fruits of the civil war are still vital for mischief even in the midst of all our modern progress. Mr. Lecky points to Cromwell's campaign as 'exercising a powerful and living influence in sustaining 'the hatred both of England and of Protestantism' in the Irish mind; but he seems not to know that the events of 1641-2 have likewise had the effect of sustaining a most persistent hostility in the minds of a large class of Irish Protestants towards their Catholic countrymen. There is no parallel in any other country to the restraint upon social intercourse which exists between the two classes in Ulster. The existence of the Orange Society is, no doubt, an anachronism, but it is a significant proof of the vitality of the ill-will which makes it so difficult to maintain order in the most prosperous part of Ireland.* It would seem as if time which wears down the greatest monuments of human labour had but little effect in softening the bitterness of sectarian antipathy. There might be some hope of establishing better relations between Orangemen and Nationalists but for the persistency with which Catholic writers refuse to acknowledge the misdeeds of their fathers. There has been no similar reluctance on the part of Protestant writers to

* It is a somewhat remarkable fact that the county Armagh, which was the scene of the bloodiest massacres of 1641, is now the most Orange county in Ulster. The Orange Society was founded in 1795 at one of its little villages named Loughgall, on the day after the battle of the 'Diamond,' in which thirty Catholics were left dead on the field. One of the depositions vividly describes the murder of a hundred Protestants at one time in the church of this village.

confess the crimes of the English Government, or on the part of Protestant statesmen to make amends for past injustice by the boldest schemes of legislation. There never can be an approach to a better understanding till there is a frank recognition on both sides of the true facts of history. Englishmen and Irishmen can only meet on a basis of truth. It is therefore the duty of public writers to expose those disgraceful travesties of history which suggest the thought that the same passions which caused the massacres of the seventeenth century now prompt the lie that would deny or disown them.

If history has any lessons for our guidance or warning, it teaches that the Irish people, whose destinies have been so long inextricably linked with our own, have always lost by every resort to force, while all they have ever gained has been by the course of legitimate constitutional agitation. They have been very slow to learn this lesson, if even yet they have learned it effectually. They boast with truth of their tenacity of character, as manifest especially in their persistent Nationalism, but what after all is the worth of a quality which fails to translate itself into solid fact? Their great fault is that they do not look realities in the face, that they shut their eyes to all views of the situation but their own, and therefore they have no firm hold upon the present. England is not ashamed to say that she has learned much from experience. She has learned that no nation acts wisely which stands upon injustice in reliance on its strength. She has revolutionised all the conditions of Irish society, but the very success that has crowned her efforts seems only to provoke a certain class of Irishmen into a more irreconcilable attitude of hostility toward Great Britain. She has been strong enough to destroy injustice, but she cannot change the nature of men. Irishmen must learn once for all that there is nothing in our marked amelioration of feeling towards themselves, in our increased tolerance of insult and injury, even in our increasing effort to understand Irish wishes on all subjects whatsoever, to justify the expectation that we will ever consent to make concessions to Nationalism which would only exasperate all the evils under which their country has suffered for centuries.

ART. VIII.—*History of China.* By DEMETRIUS CHARLES BOULGER. Three Volumes. London: 1881–1884.

AT the moment when hostilities have broken out between France and China, the recent publication of the third and concluding volume of Mr. Boulger's valuable 'History of China' could not be better timed. The two preceding volumes of this important book, which have been for some time before the public, deal at length with the long, but little known, annals of Chinese history and the Mogul conquest, but as they are of secondary interest at the present time, we shall confine ourselves on this occasion to the latest portion of the work. This third volume takes up the story at the close of the last century and brings it down to the year 1881, when for the first time a Chinese Ambassador signed a Treaty with a European sovereign in his capital. The close is well chosen, for it marks the final triumph of the doctrine of international equality, which it was the object of ambassadors and commissioners, of consuls and merchant princes, of admirals and generals, to impress or enforce upon the unwilling mind of the emperor and his court at Peking. Mr. Boulger shows a clear judgement in selecting this as the motive-power and chief aim of the long series of negotiations and wars he describes in this thick volume of over 800 pages. 'The grand incompatibility of Chinese pretensions with universal right' was the real ground of all our contentions with the Celestial Empire. If there is one characteristic that strikes one more than any other in the Chinese people, and especially in their official class, it is their supreme self-complacency. Even the really lofty moral and philosophical tone of their manifestos and decrees is marred by the innate conceit of the sentiments. They all seem to breathe the monotonous refrain, 'There is no people so wise, so good, or so powerful as ourselves.' The Chinese official documents, with their assumption of universal philanthropy and far-reaching philosophic principles, which are too seldom carried into the sphere of action, appear to us the very apotheosis of cant. With all their magnificent platitudes, these Chinese philosophers were the narrowest and most ignorant people on the face of the earth. They knew their own classics, and understood how to oppress their own subjects, but there the limitless wisdom of which they boasted stoppèd. They knew nothing outside China, they had no imagination, and they did not wish to learn. The empire

of the Son of Heaven was enough and more than enough for their highest aspirations. As for the Fan-kwei, the 'foreign devils,' what they did or thought could not signify one iota to the mind of the Celestial, wrapped in the contemplation of his own perfection. A manifesto in 1842 described the humble people of this country in the following terms :

'There is that English nation, whose ruler is now a woman and then a man; its people at one time like birds and then like beasts; with dispositions more fierce and furious than the tiger or wolf, and hearts more greedy than the snake or hog, . . . like the demon of the night they suddenly exalt themselves. . . . Now these English rebels are barbarians dwelling in a petty island beyond our domains, yet their coming throws myriads of miles of country into turmoil, while their numbers do not exceed a few myriads. What could be easier than for our celestial dynasty to exert its fulness of power and exterminate these contemptible sea-going imps, just as the blast bends the pliant bamboo? We have heard that the English intend to come into P'earl river and make a settlement; this will not, however, stop at Chinese and foreigners merely dwelling together, for men and beasts cannot endure each other; it will be like opening the door and bowing in the thief, or setting the gate ajar and letting the wolf in. . . . If we do not permit them to dwell with us under the same heaven, our spirits will feel no shame; but if we willingly consent to live with them, we may in truth be deemed insensate.'

This is the spirit that animated the Chinese resistance to foreign intercourse. Everyone but a Chinaman was a mere 'beast,' and to associate with him was a degradation. 'The 'barbarians' said the Government, 'are like beasts, and not 'to be ruled on the same principles as citizens. Were any-one to attempt controlling them by the great maxims of 'reason, it would tend to nothing but confusion. The ancient 'kings well understood this, and accordingly ruled barbarians by misrule; therefore to rule barbarians by misrule 'is the true and best way of ruling them.' This is very much like some of our Anglo-Indian maxims about Asiatic nations, but it reads absurdly when turned against ourselves. The position was untenable. Unless we were prepared 'to cancel all the obligations of international 'relations, 'to deny the claims of a common humanity,' as Mr. Boulger rather grandiloquently puts it, 'to maintain that the 'deficiencies of one region are not to be supplied by the 'abundance of another, and to hand down to future generations a legacy of closed frontiers, public suspicion, and in- 'terminable strife,' this arrogant pretension of China to superb isolation must be rejected and broken down. The

whole of our relations with China, the whole ground and basis of our wars, has been this one resolve—to claim equal treatment as subjects of an equal state. Nothing but invincible power to preserve this superb isolation could render the Chinese position possible. That power was wanting, as we were compelled to demonstrate on more than one occasion, and the power being wanting the pretension must be abandoned. It must be acknowledged that in the last half century considerable results have been obtained. China has been opened. Not only are the representatives of the European Powers received at Peking, but Chinese Ministers of great ability and shrewdness are resident in the Courts of Europe. The barbarous ignorance of foreign states and customs to which we have just adverted, no longer exists. On the contrary, the Chinese Government borrows largely from the arts, the arms, and the science of the West, and an immense emigration of the people brings them into contact with America, Australia, and other lands.

A careful examination of the incidents recorded in Mr. Boulger's third volume shows that for forty years we have been steadily working away at the demolition of their exclusive pretensions. The East India Company had a different policy—the policy of a trading company. Submission to all the demands of the Chinese authorities was the rule among the Company's servants. Do in China as the Chinamen do, was their maxim. This was a possible principle for a body of traders, but the matter stood on other grounds when the charter of the Company expired, and the English Government undertook the supervision of the trade in Chinese waters. When Lord Napier went to Canton in 1834, he found that the submissive attitude of the Company had only encouraged the Chinese officials in maintaining an unapproachable and intolerable position of superiority—

‘During the first fifteen years of Taoukwang's reign, the pretensions of the Emperor of China as the great sovereign of the world were preserved intact. During that period all diplomatic intercourse with the Western peoples was broken off, while the frequent embassies from the states of Asia confirmed the appearance of supremacy, and contributed to swell the pride of Taoukwang. Envoys from the tributary states of Burmah, Siam, and Cochin-China arrived in due succession, and resided for the stated period at the capital. The neighbouring potentates carried their grievances for settlement to the foot of the Dragon Throne, and the increasing intercourse with foreigners at Canton was a cause of anxiety within the Imperial Cabinet rather than the sign of any waning power among the feudatory states. Riots in Szchuen and Kansuh, the revival of piratical efforts on the Canton

river, were no more than ordinary occurrences in the life of a vast empire; and, although the introduction of high-priced and greatly-prized European articles into the country had entailed the increase of smuggling, the evil was then and afterwards only a local nuisance. Up to this point China had remained undisturbed in a world of her own.'

Lord Napier's arrival as Chief Superintendent of Trade brought the first shock to this self-satisfied condition of the Chinese Government. The 'barbarian eye' as they termed him, was not disposed to submit to the conditions which had been accepted by the East India Company. He would not remain at Macao, as ordered, but coolly proceeded to Canton to deliver his letter to the Viceroy in person. This was an innovation not to be tolerated by the inaccessible chief official of a Chinese province. No 'outer barbarian' had ever ventured to claim an interview before, and who was this 'eye' that he should demand a reception as an equal by an officer of the Son of Heaven? The thing was not to be thought of, and Lord Napier was told that his letter must come in the form of a humble petition through the usual medium of the Hong merchants. This was, in fact, the mode in which the Company's servants had approached the august viceroys of Canton. Requests and grievances had to be meekly presented as the petitions of inferiors, no European was suffered to enter the town of Canton, and no circumstance was permitted that could suggest the possibility of an equality subsisting between the 'foreign devils' and the dignitaries of the Celestial Empire. Lord Napier was utterly unable to break down this barrier. He was forced to retire from the dignified position that he had taken up, and though he never consented to be received on the terms offered by the Viceroy, he was decisively worsted in the diplomatic contest. After his death his successor, Captain Elliot, continued his efforts to obtain equal rights for foreigners at Canton, though he had to deal with a man of inflexible determination and extraordinary astuteness. It is not necessary to follow all the details of the struggle between the two representatives of Chinese isolation and international rights, or to recount the numerous attacks upon British subjects, the reprisals, the spirited conduct of Captain Elliot, who found himself in a very difficult position, and the long dispute about the opium trade which immediately preceded the first English war; it is enough to point out, that whatever was the immediate provocative of war, whether the action of Lin in seizing the opium stores, or the several frays between English sailors and the Chinese, the real cause of

the war was the fixed determination of China to allow no foreigners equal rights in her ports, and the no less firm resolve of the British Government that English representatives should be received in China as became the dignity of the power by whom they were accredited, and that British merchants should be freed from the humiliating conditions under which they had hitherto been forced to carry on their commerce. As Mr. Boulger says:—

‘More than one cause contributed to the result, but in 1840 the question had been reduced to the simplest proportions. The Chinese did not wish the foreigners to remain even at Canton, except in the most subservient capacity. Did the English possess the power and the resolution to compel what the stronger race ever calls proper treatment? and, as it was a contest of wits as well as of armaments, would they show themselves sufficiently diplomatic to obtain from the astutest people in Asia some valid guarantee for the security of their persons and property, and for respect towards their Government, when the naval and military forces that obtained these concessions had been withdrawn? That was the question that had to be decided.’

Mr. Boulger deprecates the assumption that it was in any sense an ‘opium war.’ He takes a broader view of this much-debated subject. The opium trade had its part among the causes of the first English war with China. It was a very unpleasant ground of a war, but fortunately it was not the sole, or even the principal, cause. Yet even in the matter of the opium trade it is not easy to see what the British Government could have done to meet the wishes of the Chinese. The people liked the drug, and would not do without it; the official classes, to a man, smoked it; and, in spite of all that Dr. Wells Williams urges about the noble efforts of the Chinese Government to put down the infamous habit, it is difficult to believe they were in earnest, and quite impossible to credit the lower officials with even a pretence of wishing to see the traffic abolished. Granting that opium-smoking is more hurtful than chewing quids of tobacco, and that it is perhaps to be ranked with the immoderate use of strong liquors as a serious cause of demoralisation among a nation, why should the British Government take upon itself to protect the Chinese from themselves? It were a highly moral task, but where would be the end of such philanthropic undertakings? Supposing the total-abstaining mania to become predominant in England, should we expect France and Spain to restrain their merchants from sending the wines of their countries over here? The nation that believes that an import is

harmful is the proper authority to take steps for its prohibition, not the nation that exports the article. If China was not strong enough to stop the importation of opium, the proper course was to legalise it as an import, place a prohibitive duty on it, and punish those who indulged in the practice of smoking it. So long as opium was manufactured at Patna or Benares, so long as the poppy flowered on the plains of Malwa, so long could no human power, save the strong arm of Chinese authority itself, prevent its finding its way to the most profitable market in Canton or the other parts of China. Our wish to see that power exerted may be—nay, must be—unequivocal, and yet we shall fail to see the need or the possibility of assisting Chinese weakness by an unprecedented exercise of executive authority on the part of the Government of India.

But altogether apart from the complicated question of international duties in regard to a traffic supposed to be injurious, Mr. Boulger is probably right when he repudiates the title of an opium war for the campaign of 1842. Opium was, no doubt, among the provocatives of the war, but that did not make it a war solely undertaken for the defence of the obnoxious trade. The compensation that was demanded and obtained for the stores of opium destroyed by Commissioner Lin was due, not because it was opium, but because the stores were English property, and had the article been wheat or cotton the result would have been the same. The opium question was indeed merged in a much wider and more vital debate:—

‘The real point at issue was whether the Chinese Government could be allowed the possession of rights which rendered the continuance of intercourse with foreigners an impossibility. Those claims were unrecognised in the laws of nations. They were based on the pretensions of a superiority and of a right to isolation, which the inhabitants of the same earth have never tolerated and will never allow to any single branch of the human family. What China sought to retain was a possession that no other State attempted to hold, and one which superior might alone could establish, if it could no more justify selfishness in the case of a country than in that of an individual. There was never any good reason to suppose that China possessed the sufficient strength, and the war clearly exposed the military weakness of the Celestial Empire. When people talk, therefore, of the injustice of this war as another instance of the triumph of might over right, they should recollect that it was China which, in the first place, was in the wrong in assuming an impossible position in the family of nations. The initial stages of the making of that claim were accompanied by an amount of arrogance on the part of the Chinese officials towards

foreigners, which was the fitting prelude to the destruction of their property. We cannot doubt that had these acts been condoned, there would have been no delay in enforcing the right to treating the persons of foreigners with as scant consideration as had been shown for their belongings. The lives of Europeans would have been at the mercy of a system which recognises no gradation in crime, which affords many facilities for the manufacture of false evidence, and which inflicts punishment altogether in excess, according to Western ideas, of the fault. Commissioner Lin was filled with an enthusiasm in exalting the majesty of his sovereign and the superiority of his nation, that left him no room to consider the feelings or claims of the outside peoples. They ought, in his mind, to have been well satisfied at being allowed to come within even the "outer portals" of the Middle Kingdom, and, in return for this favour, they should have been willing to show due subordination and humility in face of insult, danger, and tyrannical interference. All this was, of course, intolerable, and not to be acquiesced in by the meekest of people; and the English, with all their lip-zeal about equal rights and the virtue of timely concessions, are not at heart a meek people at all. The inevitable result followed with rather more delay than might have been expected—a fact which may be attributed to the distance between Canton and London, and the imperfections in the existing means of communication; but it may be confidently said that were any Chinese official to now attempt the acts of high-handed authority which made the name of Commissioner Lin historical, the redress would have to be far more promptly rendered than it was forty years ago. Yet we cannot hope to have heard the last of the cuckoo-cry that the war of 1842 was unjust.' (Pp. 239–241.)

The war of 1842 made the first breach in the defences of Chinese impenetrability. By the Treaty of Nanking, Great Britain obtained for her subjects and foreigners generally comparative safety and respect; four new ports were opened to trade, Hong Kong was taken as a material guarantee, and direct communication was permitted between the Viceroy of Canton and the Chief Commissioner of Trade. The opium traffic was unfortunately blinked in the treaty, and much subsequent trouble was thereby laid up in store. A step was gained, but it was only the beginning of that assertion of equal rights upon which the English were resolved. Peking, the capital of the Son of Heaven, was still inviolate, no communications whatever could pass direct to the Central Government from the 'outer barbarians,' and even at Canton Europeans were still forbidden access to the city itself; the promised interviews between the Viceroy and the Chief Superintendent were more effective upon paper than in actual practice, and when they occurred the rendezvous was always outside the city. Such a position

was not all that could be desired, and when the old system of assaults on the persons of Europeans, and the inevitable reprisals, began again, the efforts of the English representatives altogether failed to bring about an understanding with Commissioner Yeh, and the position was finally rendered intolerable by the unlucky incident of the lorcha 'Arrow.' It was singularly unfortunate that, as in the case of the first war there was the colourable excuse of the opium trade to be urged by our opponents, so in the instance of the second war the immediate provocation was the controvertible question of the 'Arrow.' Mr. Boulger does not seem to see that it is possible to regard the affair as a mistake; he does not by any means agree with Mr. Justin McCarthy in his estimate of the action of Sir John Bowring and Sir Harry (then Mr.) Parkes. To him it is merely a matter of an insult to the English flag which came as the last straw after a series of humiliations to provoke a re-assertion of our national dignity. Just as in the earlier war the opium was only part of the reason for hostilities, and not the chief reason, so now the lorcha 'Arrow' was but an item in the indictment which the English Chief Superintendent had to bring against the Chinese authorities. This is certainly true, and in the second as in the first war the vital question was whether China was to preserve her pretensions to superb isolation. Still many people regard the 'Arrow' affair as a poor ground for a declaration of hostilities. The nationality of the vessel was sufficiently doubtful to give the Chinese some colour of defence for their conduct, and if the boat was not technically English no insult was involved in hauling the flag down. This is a very common view of the matter, to which Mr. Boulger does not, we think, give sufficient attention. Lord Elgin himself privately described the 'Arrow' incident as 'a wretched business' and 'a scandal,' and it is an open question whether, if our representatives had been less peremptory, we might not peaceably have obtained the concessions which we had to extort by force, and this consideration must make us more indulgent to the not dissimilar action of the French.

It may be doubted, however, whether anything short of force would have obtained that final triumph over the last barrier of Chinese inaccessibility which was gained by the march on Peking in 1860, and the appearance of the allied troops in the very heart of the capital. The concession involved in the appointment of a British minister to the court of Peking was the final blow to the long-cherished

theory of superb isolation. The 'foreign devils' had now at last obtained what they were working for all along—direct intercourse with the Central Government—and the reception for the first time by the Emperor himself of the foreign representatives in 1873, without the submissive *kotow*, was the almost unhopèd-for result of this last struggle. Mr. Boulger's view of the second war, and the sequel at Peking, is instructive :—

'The object which the more far-seeing of the English residents had, from the first hour of difficulty, stated to be necessary for satisfactory relations—direct intercourse with the Peking Government—was thus obtained after a keen and bitter struggle of thirty years. The first war, closing with the treaty of Nanking, had contributed little more to the solution of the question than to place a few additional facilities in the way of trade. The provisions which might perhaps have possessed greater importance were never enforced, and were tacitly allowed to drop. A single disastrous war had not sufficed to bring the Peking Government to reason or to warn it from traditions always remembered with a feeling of pride. The years following the signature of that treaty were not without their clouds and causes of anxiety. The refusal alone to open the gates of Canton was a most serious breach of treaty. It was followed, as we have seen, by many acts of hostility, and by a general line of policy quite incompatible with friendship. The appointment of Yeh was made for very much the same reasons as that of Lin had been—to humiliate the foreigner. It had been followed by an increased tension in the relations between the Canton Yamen and the English authorities. The too-much-debated "Arrow" case came as the last of a long series of deeds in which all diplomatic courtesy was laid aside; and, when once the English Government resorted to force, it was compelled to continue it until satisfactory results were produced, and its object attained. Success at first seemed to come for the asking. Sir Michael Seymour's victorious operations round Canton and at the mouth of the Peiho simplified the task of diplomacy; and Lord Elgin, despite the original disadvantage under which he laboured from the outbreak of the Indian mutiny and the diversion of the China expedition, was enabled, by the success of the Admiral, to conclude a favourable treaty at Tientsin.

'With the attempt, twelve months later, to obtain its ratification, the whole complication was suddenly reopened. Admission to the Peiho was refused, and when an English squadron attempted to carry its way by force, it was repulsed with heavy loss. The defeat was the more important, insomuch as it was admittedly due, not to any mistake or rashness on the part of the Admiral, but to the strength of the defences which the Chinese had erected in less than a year. Another twelve months were employed in the fitting out and despatch of an expedition of 20,000 men in all, to bring the court of Peking to a more reasonable frame of mind, and Lord Elgin was again sent to China to complete the work he had himself accomplished. We have

seen how these purposes were effected, and how the superiority of European arms and discipline was again established over another brave but ill-prepared antagonist. Although vanquished, the Chinese may be said to have come out of this war with an increased military reputation. The dissension within the empire—for, as we have yet to see, the revival of a foreign difficulty had led to increased activity on the part of the Taepings—prevented their utilising the one great advantage they might have possessed of superior numbers; and, had the other conditions of warfare been more equal, the steadiness and stubbornness of the Chinese, whenever encountered between the sea and the ramparts of Peking, were such as to justify the belief that with proper arms and under efficient leading they would have successfully defended the approach to the capital. The lesson of that campaign has been taken to heart, but after more than twenty years of re-organisation the military progress of the main Chinese army remains more problematical than their best friends could desire. They have always been slow, painfully slow, to apply the lessons of their own experience.

‘The war closed with a treaty enforcing all the concessions made by its predecessor. The right to station an ambassador at Peking signified that the great barrier of all had been broken down. The old school of politicians was put completely out of court, and a young and intelligent prince, closely connected with the emperor, assumed the personal charge of the foreign relations of the country. As one who had seen with his own eyes the misfortunes of his countrymen, he was the more disposed to adhere to what he had promised to perform. Under his direction the ratified treaty of Tientsin became a bond of union instead of an element of discord between the cabinets of London and Peking, and a termination was put, by an arrangement carried at the point of the sword, to the constant friction and recrimination, which had been the prevailing characteristic of their intercourse for a whole generation. The Chinese had been subjected to a long and bitter lesson. They had at last learned the virtue of submitting to necessity; but, although they had profited to some extent, both in peace and war, by their experience, it requires some assurance to declare that they have even now accepted the inevitable. That remains the problem of the future; but in 1860 Prince Kung came to the sensible conclusion that for that period, and until China had recovered from her internal confusion, there was nothing to be gained and much to be lost by protracted resistance to the peoples of the West. Whatever could be retained by tact and finesse were to form part of the natural rights of China, but the privileges only to be asserted in the face of Armstrong guns and rifles were to be abandoned with as good a grace as the injured feeling of a nation can ever display.’ (Vol. iii. pp. 527–530.)

We have dwelt at some length upon the history of European relations with China, because it is the portion of the general history that most concerns and interests English people, and because it is the best part of Mr. Boulger’s work. The relation of the long struggle between European

intrusion and Chinese obstruction occupies nearly half of the third volume, and in it Mr. Boulger appears to the greatest advantage. He possesses a clear, pleasant style, and groups his facts with skill and judgement. By omitting minor details, and laying stress upon the large features of the contest, he has succeeded in leaving a clear and definite impression upon the mind of his reader. He is perhaps too much of a partisan, and too little open to the arguments of those who take a different view of events and politics, to rank among the scanty number of impartial historians, but on the whole his opinions are just and statesmanlike, and are supported by genuine and weighty evidence. If he gives but one side of the question, it is the side which has probably most in its favour, and undoubtedly it is that which is most pleasing to our national sensibility.

The principal topic treated in the third volume, besides the main theme of European intercourse, is the history of the Taeping rebellion, of which we need only say that Mr. Boulger's account compares favourably in point of clearness and succinctness with some of the numerous works that have recently been published on General Gordon's early exploits. The two other great revolts, that of the Mohammedans in Yunnan, and the wide defection in Central Asia, are less fully treated, although their importance in a history of the Chinese people can hardly be exaggerated. Mr. Boulger's separate work on the 'Athalik Ghazi' is scarcely a sufficient reason for passing with so very light a hand over an insurrection which for many years deprived China of nearly the whole of her Central Asian provinces, and at one time threatened to bring her into conflict with Russia.

Mr. Boulger's history, useful and readable as it is, and as a whole much the best history of China we possess, deals with but a very small branch of what makes up the record of a nation. His is a history of China, but not a history of the Chinese people, nor in any sense what we can describe as a philosophic account of the growth of a nation. In the third volume, which is much superior to the first two, we look in vain for information as to the development or decay of the national character, the change of institutions, the nature of the provincial system of government, the working of the competitive method in the public service, the financial organisation, and a thousand other matters which an historian of a Western nation would scarcely have omitted to mention. And if this is so in the third volume, where ample materials were to hand in European works, it is even more

conspicuously wanting in the first and second volumes, where Mr. Boulger has been compelled, by his ignorance of Chinese, to rely almost wholly on Mailla's great work. Mailla is practically a translation of the Chinese annalists, but with a curious limitation. No nation possesses so complete and methodical a system of historical records as China. From time immemorial the annalists of the different dynasties have carefully recorded the events of each reign, and as their records were prepared, not to produce an effect upon the public, but for the guidance of the chief ministers of the empire, they are more impartial and trustworthy than could be expected. But the method of these annalists was to subdivide their subject into various sections—politics, economics, social and material progress, were treated separately. Mailla's work was limited to the political division of the imperial annals, and the result is that in him and in his follower, Mr. Boulger, we find only one side of the national history recorded, and scarcely a word of the other, but certainly no less important, branches of Chinese life. We look in vain in Mr. Boulger's history for any account of the growth of the Chinese people into a nation, of the infiltration of other races, and the effects of the mixture upon the national character. We read little of the advances in material progress made from time to time by this peculiar people. Even so important a subject as the invention of printing is passed over in the slightest fashion in a single footnote, in which the reader will not suspect the true history of the developement of the art, from the custom of taking blackened squeezes from engraved texts and pictures, as early, probably as the first century of our era, to the invention of moveable blocks by Pi-shing in 1045. Still less would one gather that the use of the new discovery was but sporadic until it was revived under the influence of the Jesuit missionaries in the seventeenth century. We search fruitlessly for information as to the economic conditions of the people at different epochs, or for any examination into the physical influences of climate and geological formation, although the subject has been elaborately discussed by Baron von Richthofen, and other Continental scholars. It is not that there were really no materials upon which a philosophic history might have been founded, but that Mr. Boulger has not used them. The Parisian 'Bibliotheca Sinica,' the many and various brochures of Plath and Pfizmaier, the numerous researches of English and foreign scholars, published in the Transactions of learned societies,

and in the special publications devoted to Chinese subjects, afforded much that might have been turned to account. Mr. Boulger has, however preferred to content himself with the old-fashioned ideal of a history—the story of kings and battles—and for what he has given us we are grateful, inasmuch as he has done his work well, within its limits; but to gain an insight into the larger interests of Chinese history we must still consult other books.

With all this, our information about this singular people is lamentably insufficient. What we do know of them is, perhaps, hardly the best side. With every respect for the honourable character of the great merchant houses of the treaty ports, it is still obvious that we do not get quite a fair idea of a nation by studying it solely in its commercial aspect. The population of our own trading ports is not a fair representation of the English race; we need to travel inland before we can say that we have seen the English at home. But our knowledge of the Chinese is almost wholly derived from observation at the trading centres, and we are consequently more or less prejudiced by the predominance of certain characteristics which are perhaps peculiar to those ports where Europeans most do congregate. Scholars, moreover, have been deterred from an adequate study of the Chinese by the supposition that the empire has grown up by itself without any *rapproch* with the developement of the rest of the world. Such a peculiarity would, one would think, attract rather than repel scientific investigation; but such has not been the case. Now, however, that the researches of M. Terrien de La Couperie have tended to demonstrate that China owes her first strong impulse towards civilisation to the same central source that gave letters and culture to the West, we may perhaps see more attention devoted to so remarkable an offshoot of the Babylonian genius.

Yet even as it is, we know enough about China to make us anxious to learn more. The spectacle presented by the Chinese State is unique in the experience of the world. We see a people possessing most of the requirements and comforts of a refined civilisation, yet preserving the primitive organisation of the original families and clans, and depending for the security of person and property more upon the system of mutual responsibility involved in the clan principle than upon the control of the executive. We observe an intellectual people who had constructed a philosophy before Socrates was born, who have elaborate histories and treatises, who are perhaps the most literary people in the world, and

enjoyed plays and poems, and above all philosophic discourse, while most of the peoples of the West were still in the state of barbarism; yet these cultured literary folk are absolutely devoid of imagination, and do not see the use of religion, and oppose to the proselytising zeal of the Christian missionary the unanswerable argument of the French judge: 'Je n'en vois pas la nécessité!' The Chinese Government is the most despotic on the face of the earth; yet the officials, from the lowest to the highest, are chosen by competitive examination from among the nation at large, and this democratic principle—which has been in force since the days when the English still dwelt in their German homes, and Alfred and Charlemagne as yet were not—knows no difference between the rich and the poor, the son of the Prime Minister and the ragged offspring of the common labourer. In no country is there so perfect a system of examination, nowhere is the cultivation of the mind so avowedly the first condition of success in every elevated walk of life, and yet nowhere is the official class, composed though it is of the picked residue of those who have conquered a formidable series of searching examinations, so thoroughly corrupt, extortionate, and unpatriotic. In spite of the educational basis of the Government, the nation is more loosely knit together than any other agglomeration of human beings. China is a mere jelly-fish, uniform but not cohesive, and you may cut off any part without hurting the rest. The provinces hang on to the central power in semi-independence. The financial and political organisation renders the viceroys of the several divisions practically supreme, until somebody else comes forward with a heavier bribe than they are able to offer, and they are forthwith supplanted. The slowness of communications between the various parts of the vast empire assists the naturally disjointed character of the political system to render any approach to what we call national feeling or patriotism impossible. The Chinaman has no interest in his fellow-countrymen, who live so far away that he cannot visit them, and who are continually separating from the empire and being joined on again without any perceptible effect upon the State at large.

And yet with all these elements of decay and dissolution, the Chinese have remained a separate people for thousands of years, and have resisted all tendencies to political as they have to social or material changes. They have changed, of course, slowly and imperceptibly, during the thousands

of years through which their history professes to run; but it has been by the gradual infiltration of foreign tribes and their amalgamation into the national character; it has never been by sudden or drastic measures of reform that they advanced to that position of the most civilised nation in the world which they held beyond dispute 500 years ago. They have never been a conquering folk: their wars have been wars of reconquest or resistance; they have slowly grown to cover the huge territory they now occupy, as it were, without effort on their own part. One tribe after another has been slowly and imperceptibly assimilated, their individual qualities absorbed into the whole, their advances and improvements adopted. Foreign dynasties have been quietly accepted as rulers, and have kept the throne for centuries, though every facility for revolt and the breaking up of the empire seemed to exist. The present Manchu dynasty, which has held the reins of government for more than two centuries, consists of foreigners who have taken and still take no pains to conceal the fact, and have never attempted, unlike most of the foreign elements in China, to become amalgamated with the mass of the nation. Here and everywhere there appears to be, and to have long been, imminent danger to the empire as a whole, and yet so far all experience is against the likelihood of any serious change happening to the people themselves. The Manchus may give place to a pure Chinese dynasty, but the people, if no outside influence is brought to bear upon them will remain the same.

If we ask why the Chinese have remained in this strange immovable condition for so many centuries, the answer is clear, though it may seem at first a little inadequate. The Chinese have no imagination. People without imagination never change. The Chinese are clever, cultivated, skilful craftsmen, admirable imitators, but they have no imagination, and that explains everything. They are perfectly satisfied with the dull routine of a monotonous laborious life, so long as they have enough to eat and to buy opium, and to gamble away a few *cash* now and then with the dice or dominoes, or over the glorious combats of two valiant crickets. They are a practical folk, and so long as things are pretty comfortable they do not see the use of vain aspirations. They are content with a domestic system which an imaginative and romantic mind could not endure. They are happy in a total absence of religion, because they do not perceive that religion brings *cash*, and they feel no inward promptings

towards the spiritual life. They have a scheme of morality, which, if carried out, must unquestionably deserve a very high place among the attempts to govern the conduct of the animal whom Swift acutely describes as not *rationale* but *rationis capax*, by the pure principles of reason. Here again the imagination is wanting: the highest kind of intellect, which connotes a quick and vivid imagination, demands something more than a moral system as the ground of conduct. Let it be a theology, a divine life, or an enthusiasm for the great human family, there must be a sentiment for the imagination to clothe with a compelling beauty and strength. The only sentiment the Chinese possess, the only trace of the power of imagination, is in their reverence for their ancestors, and their feeling that whatsoever a man does brings either renown or shame upon his forefathers. This is a more powerful and ennobling sentiment than is generally perceived—it is the pivot of Chinese life; but it is too large and complex a subject to be now discussed at length. Apart from this one redeeming attribute, the worship of the great dead, the Chinese mind is singularly pale and colourless, strikingly devoid of the vivifying qualities of Western intellect, empty of romance, enthusiasm—in a word, without imagination.

The problem which must sooner or later confront us, what is to be the future of this strange, unchanging, unimaginative people, is one that will engage the best speculations of philosophers. At present China is practically self-supporting; beyond the notorious opium, she imports comparatively little, when we consider her enormous extent and her population of 300,000,000. So far, also, China has been partitioned into numerous groups of distinct administrative divisions, owning little relation to each other. So far the Chinese have been able to maintain to a great degree their old belief in their own superb superiority—except, perhaps, in naval warfare—to the puny remainder of the globe. But the fashion of things is already changing. Europeans are making steady progress in their work of penetrating Chinese exclusiveness, and where the European, and above all the Englishman, enters, there follows the deluge. It is impossible that China should preserve her isolated characteristics in the face of a European determination to become intimate. The jealous dislike of foreign intrusion may continue for some time, but in the end the strangers will effect their purpose, and China will be completely open to European influences. It is not certain that these in-

fluences will at first be altogether good; influences that depend in the first place upon commercial gains seldom are; but it is certain that the result will be changes in the Chinese themselves. Only a month or two ago it was stated that the old abhorrence of railways had broken down, and that a sample railway with all appertenances was to be sent out to China, to serve as a pattern upon which the Celestials themselves would be able to construct the railroads of their own country. This is a more important step than any that has been taken since the British Ambassador forced his way into Peking. It means, if carried into execution, the destruction of the old physical barriers between the various parts of the Chinese Empire, and the inevitable consequences of prompt communication—unity and combination. This is an example of the probable course of events; jealousy will prevent the employment of foreign workmen, but a specimen machine or engine will be purchased, and the clever hands of the most industrious people in the world will multiply the design to supply the newly-recognised demand. With coal and metals at hand, cheap living, and simple habits, the Chinese may become a manufacturing nation of the first rank, and compete on favourable terms with England and America. The coal-fields of China are said to be the most extensive in the world, but they are as yet unworked.

The action of France upon China through the southern passes from Tonking will be another factor in the future progress of the empire, and one of which it is hard to prognosticate the effects. But apart from any temporary delays which may be caused by the present ill-advised war in stirring up the old antipathy to us 'outer barbarians,' the general course may be safely foreseen. China will come more and more under European influences, will greatly extend her commerce, and improve her internal organisation and supply her material needs, and we shall see a change come over the character and aims of the people. That the Chinese have held on their unchanging course for half a dozen millenniums is no rebutment to this prospect. They have never until the present century come in contact with a higher civilisation than their own; indeed, until an interval which appears absurdly short compared with the long vista of Chinese records, there was no higher civilisation for them to come into contact with. Until within the last twenty years they have not accepted that contact in any fulness or intimacy. Even now the intercourse is very partial and restricted. But it has begun, and we know enough of the

spirit of European intercourse with inferior races to be convinced that it will not stop where it is. The beginning has been made, and the onward march is absolutely inevitable in spite of any efforts the Chinese may make. We believe that the onward march will be for the benefit of China, by bringing her at last within the family of the great civilised powers, and will be of incalculable service to the world by utilising and developing to the utmost the enormous internal resources of the Celestial Empire.

There never was a moment at which it was more important to form just and accurate notions of the history, character, and policy of the Chinese, than at this time when the rulers of the French Republic have entered upon a contest with the Celestial Empire of which they hardly themselves know the cause, the motives, or the probable result. These considerations, however, appear to have no weight with the French Minister. He has learned nothing from the eminent Chinese scholars of the Institute, or from the long annals of the French Missionaries of the Faith, or from more recent political experience. His policy, as far as it is known to the world, is blind and baseless, being founded on the assumption that the Chinese could be bullied and frightened into submission by demonstrations to which he does not venture to give the name of war. M. Ferry forgets that what is to France a mere incident of colonial adventure, is to China a question of national independence and existence. It was perfectly evident, from the moment that the French effected the conquest of Annam and the occupation of Tonquin, in order to open the Red River, that questions of extreme difficulty would arise on the boundary, and that China would not submit, without resistance, to the presence of so formidable a neighbour on her southern frontier, and in a province till now dependent on the Chinese Empire. From that moment a collision was inevitable.

It would seem that the political situation of France is much better known at Peking than the policy of the court of Peking is known in Paris. The Chinese Ministers in Europe are shrewd observers of passing events. They are aware that the French Government is but an ephemeral creation, and that there are a thousand weighty reasons to dissuade the French nation from carrying on war on a great scale at a distance of twelve thousand miles from their own arsenals. The French Minister has thus drifted into a position which is neither peace nor war, and it is the interest of the Chinese to prolong that state of things, even at some

risk to themselves, because as long as it lasts France is debarred from the exercise of belligerent rights over neutrals.

We cannot foresee what will be the termination of this singular contest, and we abstain from speculation as to the operations which may be contemplated by the French Admiral, when he has strength to execute them. But we must protest against the extraordinary strain M. Ferry has put upon the international law of reprisals. Not being authorised by the Constitution of France to declare war without the assent of the Chambers, the Government have sanctioned, under the name of reprisals, acts which are pure acts of war, and which in themselves constitute a state of war. Reprisals mean the seizure of a pledge for the satisfaction of a special demand for reparation, the pledge being restored when the reparation is made. But the furtive entrance of the French vessels of war into the River Min, under colour of peace (for they saluted the Imperial flag after their arrival at Foochow), and the subsequent destruction of the arsenal and of the forts at the mouth of the river, which were taken in reverse and were therefore comparatively defenceless, are acts which nothing but an actual state of war can justify. No more formal declaration of war is needed by the Power assailed in such a manner; the fact speaks for itself. It used to be considered that orders to 'burn, sink, and destroy' the vessels of another Power, not being a declared enemy, and before a declaration of war, were piratical. Moreover, a declaration of the intentions of the French Government is due to the rest of the world, and to neutral nations having enormous interests at stake, which are seriously compromised by these hostilities. The season is now too far advanced for any serious operations to be undertaken in the present year in Northern China, which would require a much larger army than the French have as yet transported to the East. The occupation of Keelung simply involves the employment of a large garrison in the place, and it would be found that the island of Formosa is not more valuable to France than the island of Chusan was to ourselves, when we occupied and subsequently evacuated it.

These ravages on the coast, or even the occupation of one or two outlying islands, will have no effect on the heart of the Empire, though they will probably increase the irritation of the nation against foreigners to a dangerous degree. It must be confessed that the Chinese have small reason to form a high opinion of the political morality and the respect

for international law of some members of the European family. They have been wantonly assailed, and in this instance no provocation at all proceeded from them. Their attitude has been purely defensive, and such it will probably continue to be.

In conclusion we would only remind M. Ferry of a remark of the Duke of Wellington, well known in this country, when he declared in the House of Lords that nothing was more to be avoided by a great nation than 'little wars.' They are carried on with a peace establishment; they waste the resources of the country; they raise awkward questions with other Powers; and the results obtainable by such attacks on Tunis, Madagascar, and Tonquin bear no proportion at all to what they cost. The fabric of the Chinese Empire is too old and too vast to be shaken by a few depredations on the coast; it has survived far greater dangers, both internal and external; compared with the huge bulk of the Chinese nation, which is singularly united by race, by uniformity of customs, and by obedience to authority, these are but the stings of an insect; and if France were more deeply engaged in hostilities on a great scale in the far East, she might find in China the Mexico of the Republic. We trust that the mediation of some neutral Power, which China has repeatedly invoked and France refused, may still settle the dispute, which is equally mischievous to France herself, to China, and to the commerce and peace of the world.

ART. IX.—*Family Memorials.* Compiled by ANNA W. MERIVALE. (Printed for private circulation.) 1884.

SOME account of a small volume of memorials of the Merivale family may perhaps not be uninteresting to a larger circle of readers than that of the relatives and friends to whom the record is addressed. The narrative, extending over nearly a century and a half, contains, like almost all similar compilations, many curious notices of events, of character, and of manners. Perhaps not one among a hundred historians, annalists, and memoir writers, has mentioned a circumstance or rumour of which Mr. Samuel Merivale is reminded by 'the reviving news of the surrender of Quebec.' 'Montcalm's death gives me the more pleasure because he was, if I mistake not, the very Rogue that shot the poor boy that was driving him from Tavistock to Plymouth at the beginning of the War; for which crime he, by his greatness, evaded the deserved Punishment.' The story must have a foundation in fact, as the narrator lived at Tavistock, both at the time when the alleged outrage was committed, and at the date of the letter which contains the statement. Why Montcalm shot the postboy is a subject of reasonable curiosity; but it would be still more interesting to learn whether such a crime could really be committed with impunity by a nobleman and an eminent military commander in the service of a Power with which England was then at war. There was at least one precedent for the execution of a member of the Legation from a friendly Court, who had murdered an English subject.

Miss Merivale has displayed judgement and good taste in her treatment of a congenial subject. The literary and official distinction in later times of several members of her family reflects an interest on their ancestors. The founder, or first of the race whose life is recorded, was a favourable specimen of an unambitious and yet cultivated class which is little known to ordinary students of the social history of the eighteenth century. Provincial Dissenting ministers were far out of the range of Horace Walpole's acquaintance. They are not mentioned in the course of sixty years of correspondence by Mrs. Delany, and they were unknown to Boswell. The great novelists of the time did justice to the clergy of high and low degree; but Dr. Primrose, Parson Abraham Adams, Yorick, and the Dr. Harrison of Fielding's 'Amelia,' were all ornaments of the Church of England.

The defect may perhaps be supplied in many volumes of Nonconformist hagiology, but theological biographies form a perishable branch of literature; and admiring disciples are bent on commemorating spiritual zeal and religious orthodoxy rather than on recording secular habits and characteristics.

The second half of the volume consists of extracts from the letters and diaries of Miss Merivale's father, John Henry Merivale, Commissioner in the Court of Bankruptcy, who is remembered by some of the older generation as an agreeable member of society and an accomplished man of letters. Dean Merivale, who has given some assistance to his sister in her present task, quotes the statement of one of his own friends, that Mr. Merivale was the best-dressed man in London, and the opinion of another correspondent that he was the happiest of all persons known to the writer. At that time all Mr. Merivale's twelve children were alive and thriving, and his three eldest sons had already attained high academic distinction. The father, who was a sound lawyer, but not a fluent or ready advocate, had succeeded but moderately in his profession, and he was disappointed in his reasonable hope of becoming a Master in Chancery. His intimate friend Denman had, when he was himself appointed Attorney-General, obtained, as he thought, from Lord Brougham for Mr. Merivale the reversion of the next appointment but one. The promise was, for some unexplained reason, never performed; and Mr. Merivale's chance of promotion by Brougham's successors was probably weakened by his conversion in later years to Conservative opinions. His principal interest was in his literary undertakings, and he would probably have abandoned his professional career but for the judicious remonstrances of his wife and of some of his friends. He was, in his earlier days, a frequent contributor to the periodicals of the time; and he published two or three poems, since forgotten, which were so far successful that they paid their expenses. At a private school and at Cambridge he had acquired a respectable knowledge of Greek and Latin, and he was a good Italian scholar. His translations into verse from the Greek Anthology were justly praised; and he published a creditable version of Schiller's lyrical poems, having learned German, with the aid of one of his daughters, at the age of sixty. At one time he was inclined to undertake the modest and laborious task of writing a history of Devonshire, but he received insufficient encouragement from the publishers.

It is less surprising that they also threw cold water on a project of writing a Life of his grandfather, Samuel Merivale, who has consequently waited for a printed biography till now. Mr. Merivale was not deterred by the opinion of the publishers from compiling memoirs of his ancestor which 'extended to three thick and closely written volumes, the writing remarkably small, neat and correct, and the ink not as yet much faded. They would fill 'certainly not less than three bulky octavos in print.' The scale of the undertaking was too large, and the labour must have been enormous. As Mr. Merivale says, 'he [the grandfather] had only one failing that I know of, that of writing 'all he did write in shorthand.' The materials at the disposal of his biographer were abundant, for he left several volumes of letters, fifteen hundred sermons, 'theological and 'philosophical commonplaces, tracts and essays.' 'With 'materials so ample,' says Mr. Merivale in a letter to his friend Dr. Hodgson, 'for the history of my grandfather's 'mind, for other history his quiet, retired, unostentatious 'life had none, why not so interweave the history of one's 'own thoughts and prospects on a variety of the most interesting subjects, as to form the prettiest specimen of 'autheterobiography extant?' The objection of the publishers to whom he offered the work, that Samuel Merivale only corresponded 'with provincial acquaintance among 'the Dissenters, obscure men in an obscure corner of the 'country, though in many cases well-educated and intelligent,' was not inconsistent with the biographer's belief that the correspondence 'might serve to illustrate the social 'life of the middle of the last century.' His plan has now been to a certain extent completed by the pious care of his daughter. The fifteen hundred sermons, the tracts, and the commonplace books are finally remitted to oblivion, and even the few letters which are preserved are not communicated to the outer world. In the collection of family reminiscences it is better to be chary than profuse.

The name of Merivale, spelt in nine different ways, is found in the parish registers of Middleton Cheney, in Northamptonshire, in the early part of the sixteenth century. Mr. Herman Merivale, a highly competent inquirer, thought that the original name was the French Merveille, or Merville, and that Andrew Marvel's name was originally the same. Samuel Merivale, born in 1715, was the son of John Merivale, a small tradesman at Northampton, who died while Samuel was still under age. His mother and her

brother, a Baptist minister at Kettering, wished to bring him up in the straitest sect of Calvinism ; but at the age of fourteen the boy left the Baptist meeting for the congregation of the celebrated Presbyterian, Dr. Doddridge, who had established at Northampton an academy for training Nonconformist ministers. At sixteen the young convert, 'being bent on a studious life, and a preparation for the ministry, gained the very difficult point of being brought up at his (Dr. Doddridge's) feet, instead of being taken under the patronage of my Uncle Brine, and educated at free cost at the most rigid of the two Independent Academies in London.' Under his new teacher he received an education which included a knowledge of French and Latin, though he seems not to have learned Greek. He made himself agreeable in the local society, 'playing on the flute and making verses;' and he formed an attachment to a Miss Betsy Bottrell, who was somewhat higher than himself in the social scale. Her family not unreasonably objected to her marriage with a suitor who had been appointed, on the recommendation of Dr. Doddridge, as stated minister to a Presbyterian congregation at Sleaford on a stipend of 30*l.* a year. Out of his modest income he assisted his mother and her second husband, a Baptist minister of the name of Rogers, who were in straitened circumstances. The disappointment of his hopes induced him to accept a call from another congregation in the town of Tavistock. He travelled to Devonshire, after the fashion of the time, on horseback, lodging by the way for the most part at the houses of Dissenting ministers, and meeting with no mishaps, though he was sorely dismayed at the mountainous character of the country about Bath. A hundred years later he would probably have felt and expressed sincere admiration of the gentle beauty of western scenery.

He was perhaps oppressed during his journey by the prospect of an examination by a Board of sternly orthodox ministers at Exeter. His anxiety was the more natural because he already inclined to Arian, and even to Unitarian, opinions ; but, as Miss Merivale observes, in language which may perhaps be borrowed from her father, 'the fact seems to be that the principles of religious liberty to which the Nonconformist ministers were pledged forbade them to look as narrowly as they might personally wish into the views of those who offered themselves for the ministry, and that there was some mutual elasticity in the understanding between the examiners and their candidates.' It

is also possible that rigid orthodoxy could not be secured in return for stipends of 30*l.* or 45*l.* a year. The elasticity, or, as it is called by another theological school, the economy of reserving doctrines which are not acceptable to the audience, was consistently practised by Samuel Merivale, when long afterwards he became theological tutor in a Non-conformist institution at Exeter. He tells Dr. Priestley that he had encouraged the senior pupils 'to examine every controversial point with all possible freedom and impartiality as well as seriousness; but even to them I don't think it always necessary to declare my own sentiments, and choose rather to propose queries and start doubts and difficulties, when I think them mistaken and over-confident, than to make dogmatic assertions.'

The orthodox or Trinitarian inquisitors, who by a convenient 'mutual elasticity' approved of the Unitarian candidate, must have contributed to the strangely complete revolution which took place in the doctrines of the English Presbyterian Churches. In the middle, and perhaps to the close of the seventeenth century, the Scotch and English Presbyterians were closely united in doctrine and practice. From that time they began to diverge; or rather the Scotch Kirk, and the bodies which seceded from it on questions of discipline maintained the orthodox Calvinistic doctrine, while the system of Church government in England was gradually relaxed; and all the congregations, except perhaps in the neighbourhood of the Scottish Border, ultimately became Unitarians. As early as the time of his settlement at Tavistock, Samuel Merivale expressed in a private letter the opinion that 'it is the congregation rather than the neighbouring ministers who have a right to be satisfied in these things; and I cannot but think that the Exeter ministers assume an authority not belonging to them, when they insist on any declaration of my sentiments at all.' It is evident that, according to the old Presbyterian standards, the young minister of Tavistock was a schismatic in discipline, as well as a heretic in doctrine. Some years afterwards he denounces as 'malcontents' those who wished to revive the old Presbyterian orthodoxy:—

'Why must they needs have the doctrines of the Assembly's Catechism preached to them now, when none of their ministers for many scores of years had ever preached them? A fine time I should have of it, indeed, to be called to satisfy them of my belief of those doctrines. I would as soon subscribe the articles of Pope Pius' creed as the answers in that catechism relating to the Trinity, Original Sin, Justifi-

cation, &c. . . . As to any particular doctrines that may be admired on one side, and disliked on the other, the less that is said about them perhaps the better.'

An instructive account of the same change among the English Presbyterians may be found in the 'Life of Frederick 'Denison Maurice.' His father, a conscientious Presbyterian minister, and zealous Unitarian dogmatist, traced his spiritual descent to orthodox ancestors. Samuel Merivale held himself exempt from obligation to hold any definite doctrine, except the Christianity which he might himself deduce from the Bible. It is not a little remarkable that notwithstanding his claim to absolute liberty of opinion, he was earnest in the discharge of his ministerial duties, and as far as possible removed from the position of a free-thinker, in the sense in which the term was used by his contemporaries. He probably entertained no doubts of the infallibility of Scripture.

The thrift which was practicable in a small country town in the middle of the last century suggests feelings of respect and almost of envy. Mr. Merivale's sole income to the time of his marriage consisted of his stipend of 45*l.* a year, out of which he paid by instalments a debt of more than 100*l.*, for which he had made himself liable on account of his mother. In the published correspondence there is no indication of squalid poverty and no trace of discontent. At that time and place the virtues of 'plain living and high 'thinking' still existed in combination, for Mr. Merivale cultivated through life intellectual interests, and he found it natural to share the literary tastes and fashions of the day. When he afterwards became the possessor of a handsome competence, he unfeignedly regretted the change in his circumstances, because the management of his property caused him a certain amount of trouble. During the continuance of his poverty he enjoyed on fit occasions the copious hospitality of the richer members of his flock. Dining at one of their houses he found 'a very elegant 'entertainment,' which was certainly substantial and abundant. 'A Leg of Mutton boil'd, a Turkey very nicely roasted, 'a cheek of Pork, delicate mince pies, an Apple Pye and 'Gloucestershire cheese, several sorts of Pickles, and a variety 'of other Sauce. After dinner there was Brandy and Rum, and 'three sorts of Winc, and a noble Bowle of Arrack punch.' An 'innocent game at cards' followed, and 'at Tea there 'was some of the richest Sweetmeat Cake I ever tasted.' At six the guest retired, *conviva satur*, 'to Mr. Lacy's,

‘where I supped; the rest of the week I spent mostly at home reading “The Universal History.”’

On his first arrival at Tavistock Mr. Merivale had been received in the house of a tradesman, Mr. Hillow, ‘a rich old humourist—who is, indeed, at the head of the meeting, but of such a temper, as no one ever did, or can please long together.’ There was happily, ‘under the tyrannical government of an Aunt and Uncle, the crabbed old Gentleman above mentioned, a sensible, sweet, good-natured, merry, little creature,’ whom Mr. Merivale benevolently visited every day ‘to abate the rigour of her confinement.’ Though her face was ‘pretty much disfigured by Small Pox,’ the lady had ‘many charms,’ and a correspondence began under the romantic names of Fidelio and Charissa. After a short time Fidelio ‘made a discovery to her of an ardent, tender, and respectful passion,’ but it seems that his narrow circumstances delayed for three or four years the completion of their happiness. It was above all things necessary that he should clear off the debt which he had voluntarily incurred; and he confessed that he could not in less than five years save 100*l.* out of his income of 45*l.* His letters to Charissa seem to imply that the lovers were engaged, and she was probably interested in hearing how he had ‘spent the afternoon pleasantly enough at Rosalinda’s.’ The town of Tavistock then wore ‘an unusual face of gaiety. . . . We have prodigious numbers of French,’ who must have been prisoners of war, ‘that line our streets and walks, and Ladies in abundance that dress as well as they are able to attract their regards; nor is there scarce a servant girl or a labourer’s daughter but can boast of her Gallants among the Monsieurs or the souldiers.’ Perhaps Montcalm may have been one of the Monsieurs.

In course of time the tyrannical Hillow died, and Charissa’s, otherwise Miss Shellabeer’s, brother consented to the marriage, the lady bringing a handsome fortune of 800*l.* Mr. Shellabeer let a cottage to the young couple at the rent of 6*l.* for house and garden. In 1859 their circumstances were entirely changed by the death of Mrs. Merivale’s first cousin, Mr. Hillow, a rich attorney at Bideford. As he left no will, Mr. Shellabeer inherited the landed property, and the personalty was divided between the brother and sister. Mrs. Merivale’s share amounted to 10,000*l.*, and her children afterwards succeeded to the remainder. Mr. Merivale was at first greatly troubled by the accession of fortune, though he admits that there may be some advantage in providing

for his children, and being enabled to help poor relations. Otherwise 'we wanted for nothing before, and were perhaps 'as well contented in our Circumstances as most of our 'neighbours. Nor can I think the odds between threescore 'and three hundred Pounds a year of any great Account with 'respect to the real Enjoyment of Life.' 'How,' he afterwards complains, 'am I likely to groan under the additional 'load of lumber!' The next-of-kin got rid of a portion of the lumber by a form of extravagance which is only now beginning to be obsolete. It was thought proper to spend on the funeral from 400*l.* to 500*l.*, or ten years' purchase of Mr. Merivale's professional income. He rejoiced that Mr. Shellabeer's 'dispositions were conformable' to his own. 'How unhappy should I be if he were disposed to act the 'curmudging! but there was no danger of this.' The funeral ceremony seems to have been performed at the church, for, in addition to 'eight Gentlemen of the town, People of the 'best fashion, intimate Friends, and considerable Clients of 'the Deceased,' 'the mad Parson of the Parish and his Curate, 'Mr. L. and Mr. C., with the Apothecary, received Hatbands 'and belts of the best silk that could be got, and each is to 'have a ring.' Mr. L., the mad parson, who was to preach a funeral sermon on the next Sunday, and Mr. C., are distinguished as being the only clergymen who are mentioned in the memoir. Mr. Merivale's numerous correspondents were almost all, like himself, Dissenting ministers, and his lay friends apparently belonged to his own denomination. It may be doubted whether social jealousy was then as active among Nonconformist ministers, as in later times; but they and the clergy, if not their respective congregations, apparently lived side by side, like animals of different species grazing in the same field, almost unconscious of one another's existence. Even their common antipathy to new intruders into the ecclesiastical fold, such as Wesley and Whitfield, led to no concert or unity of action. A friend and correspondent of Mr. Merivale urges him to accept a call to Exeter, 'to support a congregation that has subsisted 'since the glorious Revolution of 1688—yea, to prevent it 'from being shipwrecked by Methodism and Antinomianism. 'Here's a prig just out of his shell that reads and prays to a 'parcel of weak, hot-headed Enthusiasts that would palm 'such an one as Dyer or Kenimore upon us. Could he 'carry his point, I should expect to see Whitfield in the 'Pulpit.'

Professed scholars who had enjoyed greater advantages of

study and of literary intercourse might have regarded with surprise the active intellectual curiosity of an obscure Non-conformist Minister residing in a petty provincial town. Among the books which Mr. Merivale criticises in his letters, or which he has occasion to lend or borrow, are the works of Berkeley and of Bolingbroke, and some of the dialogues of Plato in an English version. He greatly admired Voltaire, though he was dissatisfied with 'Candide.' Voltaire's "Six Discourses in Verse" seem to be an imitation of Pope's "Ethic Epistles," but I am persuaded 'tis not in the power of Voltaire to equal them, nor, indeed, in the power of any Mortal living.' The writer justly held that the poetry of Frederick the Great was inferior to that of Voltaire; and he was disgusted with the disrespectful way in which the king mentioned his own father and grandfather. He feared that Frederick 'must be ranked among the Half-thinkers or Minute Philosophers (as Berkeley 'after Cicero calls them). With Rousseau Mr. Merivale would have sympathised more heartily than with Voltaire. He had during all his life 'had a strong inclination to the 'levelling scheme,' and he thought that in a perfect state 'our necessary prerequisite must be throwing down of all Distinctions between man and man, and the enjoying all things in common, as the first Christians in Judæa did 'for some time.' The variety of his literary tastes is proved by his appreciation of works of genius of the most dissimilar kinds. In two successive letters he mentions 'Tristram Shandy' with pleasure, and Butler's 'Analogy' with warmer approval. The author of fifteen hundred sermons, and of whole volumes of theological letters and essays, deserves no little credit for the wide range of his intellectual interests. In middle life he endeavoured to learn Greek with the aid of his little daughter, who naturally acquired a knowledge of nouns and verbs more quickly than himself; but probably the experiment was not successful. The principal events of his after life were the death of his wife and of his little daughter, to whom he was passionately attached. His unwillingness to introduce into his home a stepmother to the son who was his only remaining child yielded to a romantic revival of his attachment to the Betsy Bottrell to his youth, now Mrs. Manning, a widow with an only son. Samuel Merivale died at Exeter in 1771, after a useful and happy life. He is described by his grandson and biographer, John Herman Merivale (and, as Miss Merivale truly says, the description would apply equally well to the writer), as

‘ somewhat above the middle stature, inclined, especially towards the later part of his life, to corpulence, of a smooth and fresh complexion, and with an expression of features the most remarkably benign, conciliatory, and attractive.’

At the time of Samuel Merivale’s death, his son John Merivale, who was professedly studying for the ministry, had become engaged to Ann Katenkamp, daughter of an Exeter merchant of German birth. The only impediment to the marriage, which took place as soon as John Merivale came of age, was the condition imposed by his uncle, Mr. Shellabeer, that he should complete his theological studies, and become a minister of his sect. Mr. Merivale, according to the statement of his wife, ‘ feeling a disinclination to enter the ministry, asserted his right to freedom of choice in a matter of so much importance to himself; which was opposed with much warmth and pertinacity by Mr. Shellabeer, who was never known voluntarily to give up a point he had once resolved on.’ The difficulty was after a time removed by the death of the obstinate uncle, and by succession to his considerable fortune. John Merivale never entered any profession or business, and he seems to have shrunk from the society to which he might have naturally belonged. On a small property which he bought in the neighbourhood of Exeter, he built the pleasant residence of Barton Place, which was afterwards occupied by himself and his descendants. A short account by his wife of herself and her family affords a glimpse of conditions of life still more unfamiliar than the experiences of an English Nonconformist minister. Her grandfather was a Calvinist minister at Bremen, who died, leaving his family almost without resources, in 1725. His widow thought it prudent to accept an offer made by a distant relative of her husband, living in a German town of which the name is not mentioned, to provide employment for her eldest son, Herman; and the boy, though only eight years old, concurred voluntarily in the arrangement. On his arrival at his destination the poor child found himself treated as a menial, except that he was allowed to attend school with the sons of the family. His only friend, the driver of the Bremen stage waggon, who had brought him from home, caused his dismissal by remonstrating with his employer on his unkindness. On his way home the boy accidentally fell in with another distant relative, who fortunately disliked his former master, and undertook to supply his place. In the house of his new benefactor he continued his education,

and acquired a knowledge of the rudiments of business, until at the age of fourteen he was invited to seek his fortune in England by a friend of his father who had left Bremen many years before. His third and final patron was no other than Mr. Baring, the founder of the wide-spread and powerful English family which bears his name. Young Katenkamp gradually rose to the position of chief clerk in Mr. Baring's establishment at Exeter, and at a comparatively early age he engaged in business on his own account.

Mrs. Merivale follows in detail the varying fortunes of his brothers and his sons. One of his half-brothers, to whom Herman Katenkamp had given a place in his own counting-house, left him to pick up a scanty subsistence as a wandering musician in Holland. His musical gifts were probably not appreciated in Devonshire, for Mr. Samuel Merivale remarks with contemptuous complacency that there were not two such toys (as fiddles) to be found in the county. Having been temporarily reclaimed from his vagrant life, he once more left home to embark as a common sailor on board an Indiaman, and on arriving in India he left the ship and was never heard of again. His family heard that the captain had wished him to join his musical band, but he replied that he would be a fiddler to no man, that he had hired himself as a sailor, and that no one had a right to require from him any other duty. The eldest son and second Herman Katenkamp, after many changes of occupation, became English Consul at Messina, and afterwards at a Spanish port. His fortune devolved, after the death of his widow, on his nephew, John Henry Merivale. In 1853 Mr. Herman Merivale visited Bremen, and inquired whether there were any traces of the Katenkamp family. He found that a single lady of the name had died a few years before, and that there was another branch within the territory of the city. The history of another of Miss Katenkamp's brothers throws a curious and painful light on the administrative practices which were possible towards the close of the American war. George Katenkamp was sent by his father to Genoa, that he might act as partner or agent in Italy for the Exeter firm; but he disliked business, and, after falling for a time into dissipated habits, he bought a commission in the Royal Foot Guards. In the year 1781 he became entitled to the rank of Brevet-Major by raising a company at his own expense. While he was priding himself on his success, he received orders to embark with his company for Cape Coast Castle, being joined by another company under the command

of a Captain Mackenzie. It was useless to remonstrate against his employment on obscure service in a deadly climate; but the worst was to come. Before he embarked at Portsmouth an order came from the War Office that each of the companies should leave behind them sixty men to be drafted into other regiments, and should take in their stead an equal number of convicts from the hulks in the Thames. Some of the convicts joined in a petition to have the order changed to a sentence of death; and the Major and Captain applied in turn for the reversal of the official decision. The two commanding officers, when they landed in Ireland on their way, fought a duel, in which both were slightly wounded; but no reconciliation followed. The convicts, under the lead of one of their number who had been tried twenty times at the Old Bailey, had already begun preparations for scuttling the ship, when the plot was discovered and the ringleaders hanged. Within two or three weeks of their arrival at Cape Coast Castle, nearly two-thirds of the two companies, including Major Katenkamp, died. Captain Mackenzie survived, and amassed a considerable fortune; but, having blown one of his soldiers from the mouth of a cannon, he was brought in chains to England, and condemned to death. His sentence was commuted on condition of perpetual exile, and he went to Constantinople, where he was killed in a duel. By preserving such episodes family memorials sometimes become valuable contributions to history. A more commonplace illustration of the manners of the time was furnished by another of Miss Katenkamp's brothers, who at an early age drank himself to death. She had no reason to regret the household which she left for a marriage which proved to be prosperous and happy.

John Merivale, the only son of Samuel, was a highly creditable member of a class which is now becoming almost as rare as that to which his father had belonged. His fortune and education might have entitled him to aspire to a rank somewhat above that of the smaller provincial gentry; but he was retiring in his habits, and, if he had wished to take part in local public business, his nonconformity might perhaps have stood in his way. George III. is supposed to have said that the happiest condition of English life was that of a gentleman just below the rank of a Justice of the Peace. Mr. Merivale exactly satisfied the king's description. If he had lived in a remote rural district he might have been an eligible neighbour to Mr. Shandy; but the proximity of a county town, and, in later years, residence in a London

suburb, interfered with absolute seclusion. The minor gentry, who were independent of professions and trades, have been in great measure bought out and led to migrate into towns; but perhaps they may have successors of a somewhat different position, who still take an interest in that 'rational and elevated Conversation which is generally 'suffered to be lost in Oblivion and Forgetfulness.' In the same letter to his wife, Mr. Merivale tells her that he looks forward 'with pleasing anticipation to the "Feasts of Reason" "and the Flow of Soul," which, I think, we may expect the 'enjoyment of from the society of the little Circle of our improving friendships.' Mrs. Merivale, on a visit to her brother Herman in Gower Street, then in the outskirts of London, writes to her husband that 'we do not dine till five; 'and I am not yet reconciled to this new mode of living, 'though I acknowledge the convenience of doing in this 'respect as others do.' Her granddaughter has a vivid recollection of Mrs. Merivale in her later days, with 'a 'slightly formal and old-fashioned "abond," her cap with 'sober ribbons, and the short curls of light artificial hair ' (so generally worn by old ladies of that day) descending 'from under it.' The Dean of Ely supplies from personal recollection a corresponding portrait of his grandfather:—

'Dark brown bobwig and pigtail (I think), ruddy brown coat (cut-away, and with standing collar), and waistcoat with shirt-frill, black smallclothes and dark worsted stockings and buckled shoes (indoors). Hessian boots for walking and driving; no stick, and still less an umbrella; hat low, and rather broad-brimmed. I still remember the very aged horse on which he used to ride (circ. 1814), and on which I was often taken uneasily *en croupe*, which bore originally the name of Lightfoot, afterwards changed to Sprightly, out of tenderness to the fame of the great Biblical commentator.'

Mr. Merivale, notwithstanding his early distaste for the Dissenting ministry, continued through life to be, like his father, a Unitarian. The Katenkamp family had joined the same sect soon after their arrival in England. Mr. Merivale 'was a sturdy conscientious Dissenter of the old school; 'combining an absolute horror of Radicalism and disloyalty, 'as some of the old "Church and State" Dissenters did in 'those days.' When the Unitarian minister at Exeter once preached a Jacobinical sermon, Mr. Merivale withdrew for a time from the meeting and held a conventicle in his own house. His freedom from sectarian prejudice may be inferred from his sending his son to be a pupil of a Mr. Burrington who was Vicar of Chudleigh. A sister of his wife's was

married to Mr. Hole, a clergyman of good fortune and some literary pretensions; and through an acquaintance which began with their children, Mr. and Mrs. Merivale formed a close intimacy with the family of Dr. Drury, the well-known head-master of Harrow, who had an estate and residence at Dawlish. Mrs. Merivale's autobiography contains a series of touching accounts of the deaths of several of her young children. Of two surviving daughters one died unmarried. Her sister married Mr. Mallet, son of M. Mallet du Pan, well known in the early part of the French Revolution as a constitutional royalist. A son of the marriage, the Rt. Hon. Sir Louis Mallet, after holding other positions in the public service, succeeded Herman Merivale as Under Secretary of State for India. The only son who arrived at maturity, John Henry Merivale, married a daughter of Dr. Drury. A sketch has already been given of his uneventful career. His diaries have an interest of a different kind from that of the memoirs and letters of his grandfather. Novelty and familiarity of recorded manners and customs are almost equally attractive in a biography.

The change of manners in the two generations which intervened seems to have been greater than the difference of thought and language between the early part of the nineteenth century and the present time. If the result of the comparison is not illusory, the modern character of those who were young in the days of the Regency is the more remarkable because political material and change has, in the later period, been far more rapid and more complete. Some allowance must be made for the gradual elevation in social rank of the descendants of the Northampton tradesman and the Tavistock Unitarian minister, though Samuel Merivale was as far removed from illiterate vulgarity as his accomplished grandson. When the young barrister settled in London, and when he married, the old aristocratic constitution was apparently in full vigour, and stage-coaches supplied the ordinary means of locomotion. It would be tedious to enumerate all the real or supposed political anomalies which have since disappeared, or the benefits of railways and steamboats, of cheap postage, of repealed taxes, of abolished restrictions on trade, and of other improvements which have long served as commonplaces for popular declaimers. It is nevertheless certain that the lawyer or man of letters of sixty years ago would find himself more at home in a drawing-room of the present time than his grandfather or perhaps his father would have felt in the society

which his descendant frequented in the early part of the century. John Henry Merivale was fortunate in his associates at St. John's College, Cambridge, some of whom became his friends for life. The most intimate and one of the most constant was Mr. Denman, afterwards a peer and Lord Chief Justice. Another contemporary was Mr. Tennyson, who will be remembered as Lord Tennyson's father; Harry and Benjamin Drury, sons of Dr. Drury, formed a part of the same circle. Mr. Hodgson, the friend of Lord Byron, who became Provost of Eton, was two or three years younger. As a Dissenter Mr. Merivale was unable to take a degree, and, if his biographer is not misinformed, to enter the final examination. The Dean of Ely, if he has approved the statement, is not likely to be mistaken on a point of academic practice; but in his own time Dissenters, though they were still excluded from University degrees, often took honours at Cambridge. Another explanation might be found in the determination both of Merivale and of Denman to abandon the distasteful study of mathematics. Both of them lived to see their own want of University distinction supplied, probably with higher satisfaction to themselves, in the next generation.

The representatives of the Merivale family appear, by a not uncommon reaction, to have habitually deserted the political opinions in which they had been brought up. It was probably under the influence of Denman that Merivale gave a vote, which must have been a faggot vote, as he had certainly no property in Middlesex, 'in the cause of liberty' for Byng and Burdett. The only remarkable incident of the day which the diarist notices is that, for want of a horse or of a riding-dress, the supporter of liberty went down to Brentford on the polling day 'in one of the baronet's five 'hundred coaches.' It might perhaps be even now an advantage if democratic agitation were confined to candidates who could afford to have five hundred coaches. Fifteen years later Mr. Merivale shared the alarm, now almost forgotten, which was not without reason excited by the queen's trial. It is interesting to be reminded that moderate and intelligent politicians then apprehended the establishment of 'a military government backed by all the power of the 'Holy Alliance.' As Mr. Merivale justly remarks: 'We 'are certainly not ripe for such a revolution, and the 'whole proceeding seems pregnant with the overthrow of 'the Brunswick dynasty.' Denman, who, with excusable enthusiasm, believed that his injured client was necessarily

innocent, told his friend that he was impressed with a very high opinion of the queen's masculine sense as well as spirit. He says: 'She seems born to command, and calculated to prove that kings and princes are of a different race of beings from mere ordinary mortals.' At a later period, reading over calmly the report of the trial, Mr. Merivale satisfied himself both of the guilt of the queen and that there were grave errors of judgement in the conduct of her case by Brougham and Denman. In 1819 Dr. Baillie, brother-in-law of Mr. Denman, told him that the king, who died in the following year, 'bade as fair for life as any man could do at the age of eighty, and was happier than any man in his dominions.' 'I asked whether there is any intellectual enjoyment? "That of the most joyous imagination." Is he conscious of his rank? Does he know that he is a sovereign? Implied affirmatively, but I must ask no more questions.' An anecdote of George III. of earlier date is characteristic of both persons concerned. Lord Northington, when Master of the Rolls, asked permission of the king to hold morning instead of evening sittings. The king, objecting as usual to any change of custom, asked the reason of the application. Lord Northington replied that the existing practice went against his conscience, for, being in the habit of getting drunk in the afternoon, he could not answer for the justice of his decisions. 'This is one of the Chancellor's stories, who says he had it from the old king, who used to relate it as a proof of his (Lord Northington's) scrupulous honesty.' It seems not to have occurred to the king that the Master of the Rolls might with equal honesty have kept himself sober till the day's sitting was over. Mr. Merivale, though he had little intercourse with Lord Eldon, always speaks of him in a kindly spirit. Having written a pamphlet in support of one of Sir Samuel Romilly's measures for improving penal legislation, Mr. Merivale heard himself violently attacked in the House of Lords by Lord Ellenborough. 'The Chancellor, though an opponent, and though his arguments appeared to me most particularly weak and futile, spoke, as he always does, like a gentleman, and, without specifying anybody, attributed in general terms the most honourable and disinterested motives to *all* who had brought the question forward, either in debate or publication.' In 1827, when Lord Liverpool's Government was broken up, Mr. Merivale says, 'I saw the poor old Chancellor in his private room, and congratulated him on his release from toil, thinking it

'would be far more soothing to his spirit to treat it as an entirely voluntary act, and one of his own honest seeking, than to affect to treat him as a victim, and bewail his retirement. He did not seem much disposed, however, to relish this view of the matter, and, in talking of the pain it gives him to leave the Court, he actually shed tears.' Lord Eldon's disappointment at his exclusion a few months afterwards from the Duke of Wellington's Cabinet was probably still more severe.

The diary contains few notices of political personages. As an author and scholar Mr. Merivale naturally associated with some of the principal writers and men of letters of his time; and his connexion and intimacy with Mr. Henry Drury led to a temporary acquaintance with Byron. During a visit to Harrow, as early as 1802, he 'had the honour of hearing Lord Byron read his lesson in the Latin Grammar.' In 1814 Lord Byron, addressing him as 'My dear Merivale,' compliments him on his poem of 'Roncesvaux.' When he afterwards read Moore's 'Life of Byron' he found that almost every page called up some old association. 'The mention made of my own name, though in two or three passages only, is extremely gratifying, the more so as Frank Hodgson always assured me that Byron had a sincere regard for me, and these passages, I think, prove it.' At one of their few meetings, Scott told 'inimitably well' a horrible legendary story. On another occasion Sheridan was 'very entertaining during his second bottle.' His third made him quite a bore and a sot.' When Byron entertained Denman and others at Henry Drury's with anecdotes of his intrigues, Merivale, and probably the rest of the audience, 'potently doubted their veracity.' Among other celebrated or notorious persons whom he encountered in the course of his life was Irving, then at the highest point of his brief popularity. When he first heard Irving preach, he thought that he had never seen the 'combination of all the qualities of an orator in such high perfection: force of imagery equal to Jeremy Taylor, flow of words &c. resembling Barrow, enthusiasm exerted in the cause of piety and virtue, entire truth and sincerity, were among the excellencies of the youthful preacher.' On a second or third visit there were 'no great faults, but less of splendour to redeem them;' and a meeting with Irving at Basil Montagu's house seems to have dissipated the remains of the original illusion. Irving 'received us as if he were *maître d'hôtel*, and took the visit entirely

‘to himself.’ He confessed that he had scarcely read a syllable of Byron’s ‘Vision of Judgment,’ which he had denounced by name from his pulpit. ‘I did not see enough of him to form a judgment, but what I did was not favourable.’ ‘We had the lover, Barry Cornwall, by far the ‘best of the company.’ The name of another well-known writer of the time still retains a reflected interest. Merivale called on Isaac Disraeli, to consult him on a scheme of publishing certain papers, and found him living ‘in a magnificent house (for an author) in Bloomsbury Square.’ On one occasion Disraeli told him that he would leave off writing if he could no longer make 100*l.* a month. Merivale afterwards says that ‘Disraeli himself is incredibly, ‘almost ludicrously, dull in conversation, perpetually aiming ‘at something like wit, and attempting to tell a story, in ‘which he uniformly fails, in a manner burlesque enough to ‘be made a stage character.’ A much abler person, Sir Benjamin Brodie, astonished Mr. Merivale, at whose house he was dining, by discussing mesmerism ‘in terms such as ‘have seldom been used since Alexander cut the Gordian ‘knot. Every difficulty which is otherwise insurmountable ‘he gets rid of by denouncing it as a lie!’ Still more audacious sceptics have sometimes added to the same solution the statement that the lie was told by ‘persons incapable of deception.’

Even when he voted at Brentford ‘in the cause of liberty,’ Merivale had been but a moderate Whig, and the introduction of the Reform Bill ‘occupied his thoughts in the way ‘of gradual alienation from its promoters.’ In December 1831 he subscribed to the Reform Election Fund, ‘his last ‘act of Whiggism.’ In the general election of 1835, after the dismissal of Lord Melbourne’s Government, he took an intense interest, having now become a zealous Conservative; and, though he was suffering from cold and influenza, he ‘got out of bed in the midst of bitter snow and frost to ‘record a vote for the Conservatives of Finsbury.’ The alarm which was caused by the Reform Bill is not without historical importance, though it may suggest erroneous inferences. Moderate politicians who supported the measure were justified by the result in their judgement that the Bill was not revolutionary. Their opponents were right in their anticipation that it would be followed by ulterior changes, but few of them expected that the new Constitution would last for thirty-five years. If the franchise and distribution of seats, which were established by Lord Grey and his col-

leagues, had survived to the present time, the House of Commons would probably now be controlled by a permanent Conservative majority. At an earlier time Mr. Merivale underwent a change of opinion on subjects in which he felt a deeper interest than in party politics. His sympathies had become gradually alienated from the religious communion in which he was born and bred, and his studies convinced him of the soundness of Church of England doctrines. He persuaded himself that his grandfather might, if he had lived longer, have arrived at the same conclusion. Yet the published remains of Samuel Merivale indicate a continually growing indifference to theological dogma. The Unitarian minister at Exeter, to whose congregation the elder Mr. Merivale still belonged, told the son that his grandfather's sermons would by no means suit the present opinion and temper of the sect. Its members and teachers had probably in the course of two generations drifted as far from the early Unitarian creed as its first professors from the Presbyterian standards of the seventeenth century. Conversions from one Protestant communion to another are now becoming rare; but among the upper classes, and perhaps over a wider area, the Church has within fifty or sixty years probably gained largely on Nonconformist bodies, and especially on the cultivated, thoughtful, and unimaginative Unitarians.

In 1844 Mr. Merivale died suddenly at the age of sixty, after a life which was singularly happy and prosperous, though it was unmarked by any brilliant success. He deeply enjoyed the early promise of his sons, and he lived to see it fulfilled in their subsequent distinction. Of two of them who died in his lifetime, one had taken high honours at Cambridge, and had been a Fellow of Trinity College. His names, Alexander Frederick, record the date of his birth, as they commemorated the visit to England of the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia. The historian of the Roman Empire happily survives, and five years have already passed since he was an honoured guest at the University boat-race dinner in celebration of a jubilee dating from 1829, when he pulled in the Cambridge boat at Henley. The time has not yet come for a full record of the life of the Dean's elder brother, Herman Merivale, well known both as an able public servant and as one of the most remarkable scholars of a generation which is now passing away. His precocity was almost as extraordinary as that of John Stuart Mill, and he was fortunately not exposed to the mental isolation which produced in his

famous contemporary, in combination with vast attainments and great intellectual power, incurable ignorance of character and human nature. A large family and a public school are the best correctives of the less wholesome tendencies which beset premature development of the intellectual faculties. At the age of ten Herman Merivale was sent to Harrow under the care of his uncle, Henry Drury, who found on examination that 'his understanding and quickness of comprehension far exceeded anything he had expected to find.' At twelve, his father says that Herman's 'persevering fondness for Dante is one of the most extraordinary things he ever heard of,' and it would certainly be difficult to find a writer in the whole range of literature whose writings would be less attractive to an ordinary child. When about the same time he was prevented from reading by an accident to his eye, 'he translated fifty or sixty lines from memory in the *terza rima*.' Miss Merivale prints in an Appendix an elaborate review of Tasso, in a letter from Herman to his father, written before he was thirteen. In a letter of the following year he sends his father the results of his study of Gibbon, with the remark that 'by far the most interesting fact to me of the history is that of the Arian controversy,' which he accordingly proceeds to discuss. A timid parent might perhaps have been alarmed at the early wisdom and learning of a school-boy; but Mr. Merivale was a man of sense, as he shows in a casual mention of a visit from his Harrow boys, when he 'was much pleased by the look and behaviour of both. — had a black eye from fighting with a boy of his own age and standing.' The scars of honourable warfare render the look of man or boy not less pleasing to a judicious father.

Having gained all the prizes and honours which could be won at Harrow, Herman Merivale renewed and increased his triumphs at Oxford, where he afterwards for a short time took private pupils, one of whom, now Cardinal Manning, has sometimes asserted more or less seriously, that he had through life felt a kind of respectful fear as often as he met his former tutor. At an early age Herman Merivale became Professor of Political Economy at Oxford, having already begun to practise at the bar, where he joined the Western Circuit. A work on the Colonies, which originated in his lectures as Professor, was probably the cause of a later change in his career. Though he published little in his own name, Herman Merivale was a voluminous writer on literary, economical, historical, and political subjects; and it may

be mentioned that he was for many years a frequent contributor to this Journal. In his case the alternation of political opinion among successive representatives of the family was once more exemplified. From his early youth and throughout his life Herman Merivale was a resolute and consistent Whig of the school to which Romilly, Lord John Russell, and Macaulay belonged. He made no attempt to enter Parliament, and it is not known whether he was desirous of distinction in public life. A somewhat abrupt and occasionally sarcastic manner suggested a doubt whether he would have succeeded as a debater; but his abundant knowledge and his great ability would probably have given him a high position in the House of Commons among the class of members which was conspicuously represented by Sir George Lewis. At the bar Herman Merivale's progress was not rapid but steady, as became a well-instructed and sagacious lawyer who had not the qualities of a popular advocate. If he had not left the profession he would probably have risen to the bench; but he may perhaps have been impatient of deferred success, when in 1847 he accepted Lord Grey's offer of the place of Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. Several years afterwards he exchanged his office for the corresponding post in the Indian Department, of which Viscount Halifax, then Sir Charles Wood, was at the time the head. Merivale's strong party feeling had perhaps something to do with his preference of a chief who had always been a Whig, over the Duke of Newcastle, formerly a follower of Peel, who was then Colonial Secretary; but he fully shared the loyalty to the Government of the day which has long characterised the permanent Civil Service. The Ministers under whom he served at the Colonial and the India Office fully appreciated his merits. One Conservative Secretary of State, Lord Lytton, left on record an elaborate and eloquent eulogy of Merivale's extraordinary gifts and attainments. No competent superior or colleague could fail to recognise his great knowledge and his vigorous understanding. The history of a family which still flourishes may appropriately close for the present with the brief mention of one of the worthiest of its members.

ART. X.—1. *Political Speeches delivered in August and September, 1884, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.* Edinburgh: 1884.

2. *Speeches delivered in Edinburgh and Dalkeith in September, 1884, by the Right Hon. Sir Stafford Northcote, M.P.*

3. *Reform of Parliamentary Business: House of Lords.* By W. RATHBONE, M.P. London: 1884.

THE difficulties which blocked the path of Parliamentary Reform were stated and discussed in this Journal at the beginning of the year. These difficulties were admitted to be many and serious: some of them to be almost insuperable. They were not, however, regarded as of so grave a character as recent events have shown. No one could have supposed that the treatment in Parliament of the simple question raised by the proposal to extend the franchise to counties could have produced in the country that sort of temper which, unless restrained in time, might lead to revolution. And yet it is hardly an exaggeration to say that if the attitude which the two parties have respectively taken up be not altered consequences to the well-being of the State and to the equilibrium of the political forces in the country may be developed of a more serious kind than it was possible, nine months ago, for the most pessimist imagination to conceive.

The questions which are agitating the country to-day have very little in common with those which were just ruffling the surface of public opinion last year. In the autumn of 1883 an assembly of obscure political individuals met together in a midland town in England and passed a series of resolutions, some of them wise enough and opportune, others of them foolish and even mischievous, to the effect that the time had come when the Reform proposals which were carried by a Tory Government in 1867 with respect to the boroughs of England and Scotland, should be extended to the counties and to Ireland. That seemed a simple proposition then, and it seems a simple proposition now. Both parties in the State were practically pledged to these proposals: the Tory party by the fact that they had carried them into action in 1867, the Liberal party by the fact that every candidate in the Liberal interest, with hardly an exception, had pledged himself at the last election to see that they were passed into law by the present Parliament. There really was no controversy about the matter.

The majority of the present House of Commons were bound to see that the Executive made an effort to fulfil these pledges. Both the Liberal party and the Executive would have been guilty of a breach of faith with the nation which sent them to Parliament if this mission were neglected. The session of 1884 was thought appropriate for redeeming these pledges, and the Executive loyally endeavoured to give effect to the mandate which was imposed upon them. They introduced a thoroughgoing but a reasonable—in some senses a Conservative—measure. They devoted the whole of an arduous session to the discussion and elaboration of this measure. They were supported by large and well-sustained majorities from its introduction until it left the House of Commons. Their opponents even recognised the reasonableness of the measure, and with the recollection of the extension of the franchise to boroughs which they had effected seventeen years ago fresh in their minds it would have been hardly possible that they could do otherwise. They allowed the measure to pass from the representative House without any serious opposition. But for some hostile murmurs from two or three men of inconsiderable standing, it appeared as if this great matter on which the minds of the people were set, and on which, moreover, both sides were practically at one, was definitely settled. That there would be difficulty and trouble and perhaps delay about the scheme of redistribution was obvious to all men who gave their attention to the study of political problems. But that the matter of the franchise was to be the small cloud which was to gather and develope into a storm threatening to uproot the Constitution of this empire was an evil dream that never could have entered into the imagination of the most timorous of mankind. Yet this is the condition to which, by the perversity of the leader of the hereditary House and by the unreflecting obedience of his followers, the country has been brought. The question of the extension of the franchise and the question of redistribution of political power are almost blotted out of sight. The thoughts of the people of this country, at least in the northern provinces and towns, are diverted from the consideration of these questions and of other questions of urgent importance to the commonwealth and to the stability of the empire, and they are directed to the wider, graver, and more dangerous question of the revision of the Constitution. They are not thinking now, as they were in 1830, whether there is real grievance and oppression in the present electoral arrangements. They are not thinking,

as they were at the beginning of this year, whether or not it is wise to include Ireland in the Franchise Bill. They are not speculating on the number of citizens who are to be enfranchised. Plans of proportional representation; questions of electoral districts; disputes as to the number of representatives to be allotted to this or that country—such questions are in abeyance. They are dwarfed and have lost their former proportions. Any man who attempts to direct the attention of a public meeting to any of those points can hardly secure a hearing. The topic that arrests attention is the late action and the future destiny of the House of Lords. Talking to a Scotch meeting about electoral districts or extension of the suffrage to Ireland is like offering spoonmeat to an athlete. This vehemence of political feeling exists in a far less degree in England south of the Trent. The area of the agitation is circumscribed, and in many English counties the Conservative demonstrations have equalled or surpassed the Liberal demonstrations in size and enthusiasm. The fact is, as it appears to a dispassionate observer, that on these questions of vital import to the State the nation is pretty equally divided, and the violence of the extreme party tends rather to injure the Liberal cause and impede the progress of Reform.

It is useless now to consider in detail the causes which have led up to this most unfortunate deadlock in the working of the constitutional forces of the country. A change so gradual as to be hardly perceptible has been spreading over our Parliamentary institutions during the last fifty years. This change commenced when the Reform Act of 1832 was passed, and while its effects have been slowly becoming apparent as one Parliament after another has been elected, and one group of Parliamentary leaders after another has passed away, the full bearing of the revolution of 1832 is only now becoming realised. 'Laws preserve their inflexibility,' it has been said, 'long after the manners of a nation have yielded to the influence of time,' and so it has been with regard to the Parliamentary institutions of England. So long as the men who made the revolution of 1832 and their contemporaries guided the affairs of the nation in either House of Parliament the traditions and the habits of the pre-revolutionary time survived. So long as Lord Russell, Lord Palmerston, and Lord Derby lived Parliament was subject to their influence; and the tone in Parliament and the respect for Parliament were quite as high as they were in earlier days. But since 1867, and

after the old leaders had disappeared, the character of Parliament and the regard for Parliament have changed. 'Si *'antiquitatem spectes,'* says Sir Edward Coke, speaking of the High Court of Parliament, *'est vetustissima: si dignitatem, est honoratissima: si jurisdictionem, est capacissima.'* The antiquity of Parliament survives, the jurisdiction of Parliament is even more extensive than it was and still retains its power, but the respect for Parliament and the inherent dignity of Parliament must now, it is to be feared, be considered as among the things that were. It is useless, we say, to enquire particularly as to the causes of this transformation. Some are apparent enough, others are recondite. It is useless even to examine too closely the more direct agencies which, in these later days, have contributed especially to bring this transformation to a head at the present time. Faults there have been in both parties in the State, and in the leaders of the two parties respectively. Even in the agitation in which the country is now involved the fault is not all on one side. 'That truth-disturbing yet potent agent in political warfare—the demon of party—has seized his opportunity and is doing his utmost to render the task of impartial statesmanship almost hopelessly difficult,' as it has been well said by one who shares with many moderate men on both sides of politics the anxiety of the moment. The disease of party animosity is at its height and must, we suppose, be allowed to run its course. We do not care to enter into the war of recrimination which is being waged with so much violence throughout the country, on every platform, in every newspaper, and in every periodical. We prefer to pass from these varied and varying emotions of the day, and to consider as dispassionately as we can the new issues which are now being laid before the country.

No one, not even Mr. Goldwin Smith himself, can have less sympathy with 'prejudice tempered by street parade' than we have. The cumbersome and dangerous process of coercing one of the branches of the legislature by means of gigantic gatherings of excited humanity, the constituent elements of which cannot by any possibility have considered, much less thought out, the constitutional problems involved, inspires us neither with undue respect nor with overweening confidence. The meetings have no doubt been numerous, perhaps more numerous than they were in 1831 and 1832, though then they were all on one side. But speak to a reformer of '32 and he will tell you what a difference there is in the tone and bearing of the meetings

held then and held now respectively. The meetings held half a century ago were worthy of the seriousness of the occasion. There was oppression in those days. The voice of the people was smothered. They had no hope of being able to make their grievances heard so long as all power was concentrated in the hands of an imperious oligarchy. The meetings of that time were grave and serious incidents in the life of a nation. They were the demands of a downtrodden people calling aloud for freedom. They were earnest gatherings of determined men. They meant civil war if their demands were slighted and their oppression continued. No man who recollects the crisis of 1831 would for an instant compare the present political aspect of the country with the agitation prevailing in October of that year, when Bristol and Nottingham were in flames, when bishops were insulted in their dioceses, and peers dragged from their carriages in the streets, and one universal outcry ran through the nation, 'Down with the House of Lords!' At that time it would have cost a man his life to address a popular meeting in opposition to the Reform Bill. Happily, as far as our observation extends, no such feelings now exist at all.

Can it be said that the meetings of the last three months have been called out by oppression, or that they were suggestive of gravity and earnestness? The meetings on the one side have been convened by social attractions offered in abundance in the beautiful parks of the Tory nobility and gentlemen of England, and they could not have been assembled without them. The meetings on the other side took, to a large extent, the form of mummery and masquerading. They became incidents—burlesque incidents, some of them—of a British carnival rather than sober and determined gatherings of the people. They were suggestive of the theatre or the circus quite as much as of the crown of thorns or the political martyr's stake. The spirit of competition entered into the movement. One rich manufacturing town held a meeting one week: the neighbouring town determined to cut it out. Wealthy inhabitants subscribed the funds, and the manufactories and mills supplied the people. Demonstration Saturdays became popular. A whole holiday, a promenade, bands of music, dresses, banners, devices, speeches, an indefinite sense of doing something patriotic in a pleasant way, and cutting out the other town, all in fine autumnal weather—these were the ingredients which mixed together made up a vast number of the demon-

strations, and no reasonable man can attach serious importance to them.

We especially wish to guard ourselves against deception in the matter. But, for all that, we cannot shut our eyes to the significance of the tone which was exhibited at some at least of these gatherings. There was nothing more noticeable, according to the best informed of those who attended the recent meetings at Edinburgh, when Mr. Gladstone expounded his views on the crisis to his constituents, than the impatience with which the huge audience received his defence of a Second Chamber founded on the hereditary principle. It required all his authority and his unparalleled oratorical tact to restore the sympathies of the meeting. It required something almost like an apology from him for finding anything favourable to say of the hereditary House. It was only too clear that the House of Lords as an institution is unpopular with such an audience. The evidence of its unpopularity comes, indeed, especially from the large towns. The meetings have chiefly been held in towns, and have been mainly made up of townsfolk. Individual peers are but little known except in the immediate neighbourhood of their residence. They cannot be known in the large towns, and in these the institution of the House of Lords is an object of envy and dislike. The ordinary British workman is of all things logical in a rough matter-of-fact way. He asks the question, 'Why should five hundred folk in London be entitled to deprive me of something which I am told is for my good, simply because they happen to be born in an accidental way?' These 'five hundred folk in London' constitute the House of Lords, and as such, in bulk, the peers are unpopular. In detail they are not unpopular. Individual peers are, and probably always will be, liked and adulated. The traditional love for a lord is deep set in the Anglo-Saxon character and will probably never be eradicated. Other things being equal, a man with a title will everywhere in these islands, and especially in Scotland, be preferred. But the hostility to the institution of the House of Lords in the north is a fact that must be taken into reckoning. And this, if we may judge by the recent demonstrations there, is especially the case in Scotland. The Scotch people are not subversive, neither are they extreme politicians. They are resolute and determined in a sort of half-appreciative Liberalism—more appreciative than the Liberalism of England and very much more dogged. But with all that they are not firebrands. In no part of the empire is loyalty to

the Crown and respect for eminence, whether intellectual or social, more marked than it is in Scotland. The people are not republican. They are not revolutionary. They are not often carried away by the emotion of the moment. They are shrewd and calculating and conservative of the best things in life, and unwilling to accept without consideration any radical suggestions of change. Such being their character, it would be natural to expect that the Scotch would have accepted Mr. Gladstone's plea for moderation, and that they would have been slow to contemplate with satisfaction any proposals for constitutional revision. Yet at the great representative meetings in the Corn Exchange in Edinburgh which Mr. Gladstone addressed, it appears to have struck even the least impressionable of those who were present, that the feelings of the audience were embittered against the House of Lords to such an extent that, with all their affection and enthusiasm for the Prime Minister, their own chosen member and the hero of their idolatry, they could hardly restrain themselves when he spoke the words of reason and moderation.

The questions which are under discussion at the present time no longer concern the House of Commons alone. People regard the extension of the franchise as practically settled. No Government can go back from what was done last session. Whether it be the present Government, or a Tory Government, or a Whig, or a Coalition, or a Radical Government which undertakes the settlement of the reform of the House of Commons, the Representation of the People Bill of 1884 contains the minimum which can be proposed. A Radical Government might eliminate the service franchise and abolish root and branch the remnants of faggot voting which are left in the Bill. A Tory Government of the new democratic type might, in imitation of the action of Mr. Disraeli in 1867, overtrump the provisions of the Bill by proposing manhood or universal suffrage, and, in the face of Lord Salisbury's declarations at Manchester in the direction of electoral districts (which notwithstanding his more recent efforts have not been explained away), and in the face of the support—the party support—given by the Opposition to the proposal to extend the provisions of the Bill to women, no one can regard the suggestion of manhood or universal suffrage coming from a Tory Government as an improbable one. But, looking at the matter all round, it seems certain that in the Bill of 1884 we have the franchise of the future fixed. People recognise this, and they are willing to accept it. Redistribu-

tion is not fully before them. They have Mr. Gladstone's sketch of the principles on which his scheme of redistribution will be based, and that sketch, he now proclaims, has the adhesion of his colleagues in the Cabinet. When they see the details of it and learn how the constituencies in which they are individually concerned are to be treated, they will give more attention to it. At present their eyes and thoughts are concentrated upon the Constitution, and especially upon the Second Chamber in the Constitution, and they are asking themselves and each other whether two Chambers are wanted, and, if so, whether one of them must of necessity be founded upon the hereditary principle.

These two questions have often been asked before, and they have often been discussed before; but they have never before been asked in earnest. The discussion in all past time has been an academic or debating-club discussion. Till now it has never—at least, since the Commonwealth—become a practical question. There have been far-seeing men in all time who looked forward to the day when the question would assume a practical form. Lord Stanhope, in his 'Life of Pitt,' narrates a curious conversation which passed between Mr. Pitt and the Abbé de Lagedard, at Rheims, more than a hundred years ago. 'One day,' says Lord Stanhope, 'as the young orator was expressing in warm terms his admiration of the political system which prevailed at home, the Abbé asked him, since all human things were perishable, in what part the British Constitution might first be expected to decay? Pitt mused for a moment and then answered, "The parts of our Constitution which will first perish are the prerogative of the King and the authority of the House of Peers."' Sixty years later, when Lord Lyndhurst and his following in the Upper House were making continual havoc of the Government Bills, just as Lord Salisbury and his following are doing at present, for the purpose of discrediting the Ministry, the select few who then watched political and Parliamentary questions were dismayed at the lengths to which the Upper House, presuming on the ignorance and the apathy of the people, carried their powers of obstruction. Mr. Trevelyan tells how Lord Macaulay, writing from Calcutta, prophesies that 'in a few years the House of Lords must go after Old Sarum and Gatton; and what is now passing,' he says, 'is mere skirmishing and manœuvring between two general actions. It seems to be of little consequence to the final result how these small operations turn out. When the grand battle comes to be fought I have no doubt about the event.'

So impressed was he with the sense of coming evil that he even went the length of addressing to Lord Lansdowne a carefully-reasoned letter—a State paper in all but the form—urging the imminent perils that threatened a Constitution in which a reformed House of Commons found itself face to face with an unreformed House of Lords; and setting forth in detail a scheme for reconstructing the Upper Chamber on an elective basis. A shrewd practical man of the world like Charles Greville, who could not be suspected of any sympathy with extreme democratic movements, considered that ‘the game which they [Lord Lyndhurst and his majority] play is a very desperate one, and if it fails, the House of Lords can hardly avoid suffering very materially from the conflict.’* There was a good deal of writing of that sort, and some of a more violent character, at that time. But forebodings of real danger were confined to a comparatively small body of thinkers and writers. The action of the House of Lords did not touch the feelings and the passions of the multitude. In those pre-telegraphic and pre-penny-newspaper days the multitude cared very little whether the House of Lords acted the part of a Tory agency to throw out Whig Bills or not. The political education of the people was not a fact then as it is to-day. The masses did not read the newspapers. The forces of democracy were not organised and marshalled as they are now. The multitude did not realise the fact that those august bodies which constitute the Parliament of this country were composed of very ordinary human beings like themselves. They did not know that they themselves were the masters of one of these august bodies, and could make or unmake it, and the Executive along with it, at their pleasure. There was deep respect for the House of Lords among the masses in those days, and there was no feeling of jealousy of it, because it seemed so far removed from the influence of the people that it could not be reached. They might as well be jealous of the sun as of the House of Lords, which was so much above them and so remote from their influence. The men who talked and wrote

* We refer to the passage in Mr. Greville’s *Journals* (vol. iii. pp. 288–298) in which he relates, with his usual good sense and sagacity, the contest between the Lords and Commons on the Irish Corporation Bill in 1835, when the violence and pertinacity of Lord Lyndhurst were supposed by many to be leading the House of Lords to the verge of destruction. All that was said on that occasion is equally applicable to the present crisis, but in 1835 the contest was happily ended by the good sense of Lord John Russell and the mediation of Sir Robert Peel.

about these things were mostly well-to-do people, who, like some young lords of the present day in search of a new sensation, liked to say ill-natured things about their order, believing firmly that their words would come to nothing.

It is very different now. The feelings of the people are no longer in a state of unruffled calm. The masses have been taught, and they have quickly learned, how to co-operate. They know how to put pressure on their representatives. They have discovered that they rule the Lower House, and they see an opportunity of exercising their strength upon the Upper House in the field of battle which the unwisdom of the leader of that house has selected. They know how to give expression to their desires. They are determined to rule. They see that they have the victory in their hands, and they will have their way.

But to consider the question which, as we say, has now for the first time become a practical one: Can we, as things now are, regulate our affairs, adjust our legislation, and direct our home and foreign policy through the instrumentality of a single Chamber? If this question be answered in the affirmative, the second question, as to the nature of the Second Chamber, does not require an answer. But can it be answered in the affirmative? The science of politics is a science founded on experience; and all past experience is not in favour of, but is against, government by a single Chamber. 'Time and experience,' says De Tocqueville, 'have convinced the Americans that . . . the division of the legislative power is a principle of the greatest necessity. Pennsylvania was the only one of the United States which, at first, attempted to establish a single House of Assembly; and Franklin himself was so far carried away by the necessary consequences of the principle of the sovereignty of the people as to have concurred in the measure. But the Pennsylvanians were soon obliged to change the law, and to create two Houses.' In European states the monarchy of Greece is, we believe, the only one that governs through the agency of a single Chamber. The *Boulè*, a representative Chamber elected by universal suffrage for four years, absorbs the whole of the legislative power. The extremist advocates of legislation by one Chamber will hardly point to the government of Greece as a model of stability or consistency, or as an example to be followed in this country. To be sure we have the recollection of the old Scotch Parliament, which was an instance of single-chamber government; and we have the testimony of Andrew Fairservice in favour of it. 'In

‘puir auld Seotland’s Parliament they a’ sat thegither, cheek by jowl, and then they didna need to hae the same blethers twice ower again. . . . they sate dousely down, and made laws for a haill country and kinrick, and never fashed their beards about things that were competent to the judge ordinar o’ the bounds; but I think that if ae kailwife pou’d off her neighbour’s mutch they wad hae the twasome o’ them into the Parliament House o’ Lunnun.’ No doubt the waste of time involved in having ‘the same blethers twice ower again’ is a heavy price to pay in these talking days for the existence of two Chambers. But there is something more valuable even than time, and that is freedom. On what does the basis of constitutional freedom rest? It rests on this, that no power or institution in the State should have unchecked and unlimited power. Monarchy unchecked leads to tyranny; aristocracy unchecked leads to oligarchy; democracy unchecked leads to despotism, either of the individual or of the mob. Each of these ruling agencies, when it is powerful, is impatient of checks. The democracy at present in this country is just beginning to feel its power. It is in the full vigour of youth, and with all the restless activity of a vigorous youth in it, and as yet without a full knowledge and without an assurance of its strength; it is therefore of necessity impatient of checks—it will at once be paramount. The restless spirits who guide, or who believe they guide, the democracy, are more especially impatient of anything that delays, even for a little, their cherished notions. They conceive a crude scheme of social or political reform to-day: they expect to carry it out to-morrow; they forget that they are dealing with an ancient empire with venerable traditions that will not move except at its own pace. They forget that there are great interests affected by every one of their self-confident nostrums, and that these great interests will not fall down like the walls of Jericho at every blast which these active-minded gentlemen blow upon their own trumpets. But these gentlemen are impatient of restraint; they regard every check and every delay imposed upon their will as an attack upon their rights; they recognise no co-ordinate authority. If these impatient spirits are to have their way, there is an end of the Constitution.

The veto of the Monarch has fallen into abeyance; the veto of the House of Lords would follow; and the question would then arise, how long would the House of Commons retain authority? If it opposed or delayed any measure demanded by clamour out of doors, its authority would soon be shaken.

It would be respected just as little as the authority of the House of Lords is now respected ; it would be overawed and overruled by popular movements and organised demonstrations. The Trades Union Congress met the other day and passed a series of resolutions calling upon Parliament to pass certain laws in the interest of the trades. If the Trades Unions were only a little stronger than they are, and had the House of Commons alone to deal with, they would make very short work of it. It would succumb before 'prejudice 'tempered by street parade,' just as the other authorities in the state have done. Already we see how much of its independence and its real power for usefulness the House of Commons has lost by becoming, in a great measure, the tool of the caucus and of public meetings. How very few representatives there are on either side of the House who can dare to exercise an independent judgement ; they may almost be counted on the fingers, and hardly one of them can be considered to hold a secure seat. A man of ascertained position and of great personal authority, like Mr. Goschen, may play an independent part ; but how many men can venture to follow him ? There are not a few members on both sides of the House who agree with him in most of his opinions, who approve his moderation, who admire his courage and his honesty, and who would even prefer him as their leader to those whom they respectively follow. These men, if they dared, would support him ; but they are well aware, and he is well aware, that support to him in opposition to the leaders of their respective parties could be given only at the sacrifice of their seats. Party discipline within the House, and pressure of the caucus without the House, are destructive of independence. There is no freedom where independence is thus warped ; true freedom consists in government by free legal institutions mutually aiding and checking one another. Government by a pure democracy would become an intolerable tyranny, under which no man would dare to have an opinion of his own and act upon it. Already there are indications of this subserviency of the individual judgement and will to outside influence. Mechanical obedience is taking the place of independent action. There are two guarantees of freedom, and these are division of power and a certain amount of intelligent resistance. But the upholders of single-chamber government destroy the first, and the champions of a pure democracy would annihilate, as treason to the national will, the second.

If we could have a perfect Chamber of Representatives

which was at once in accord with, and independent of, the nation; which consisted exclusively of sober-minded, intelligent, patriotic men; which was unshaken by sudden gusts of popular passion; which was removed from all selfish and sectional ambitions; which had the time, and the will, and the capacity for steady solid consideration of such measures and such policy—both foreign and domestic—as might be necessary for the well-being of the nation; and which was not exposed to the blighting influence of party, or subservient to the domination of a single will: if we had, or were likely to have, an ideal Chamber such as this, then it might be said that a single Chamber was sufficient. Such a Chamber would be at once a suggesting and a revising Chamber: at once a house of origination and of criticism. Such a Chamber would in itself provide a wholesome division of power and the requisite amount of intelligent resistance. But can it for a moment be said that the present House of Commons comes anywhere near to this ideal standard? or is it at all probable that the people's representatives in future Parliaments are likely to attain to it? Is the country satisfied with the conduct and proceedings of the Lower House as at present constituted? Are the members of the Lower House themselves satisfied with its condition? Can it be said to be in accord with, and independent of, the nation? If it is in accord with the nation, why that never-ending, never-resting struggle with the representatives from Ireland? If it is independent, why that blind terror of central managers and local caucuses? Can it be said—rather would it not be the grossest flattery to say, that it consists exclusively of sober-minded, intelligent, far-seeing, patriotic men? There are men in the House of Commons to whom all these attributes can be honestly applied; more of them, perhaps, in the present Parliament than in any of its predecessors of recent date. Take the members individually, and there is hardly a department of intellectual or practical life which is not worthily represented. But, for all that, the tone of the assembly is not high; it rarely rises to real eminence. There is an all-pervading air of mediocrity about it: honest mediocrity, perhaps, but something that cannot be dignified by a higher name. And the reason is not far to seek. The best men, outside the ranks of the Administration, are silent; they recognise the difficulties, we had almost said the hopelessness, of the Parliamentary position; they do not wish to add to the intricacy and perplexity of the situation, and—like the present Speaker while he continued in the ranks of the unknown—prefer to linger on in mute inglorious silence

rather than run the risk of increasing the difficulties of Parliamentary government. They abstain from speaking, and in consequence of their abstinence the mediocrities rush in. A list has been recently published of some fifty-six of these 'chattering delinquents,' men who monopolised 62 per cent. of Parliamentary time, and spoke 5,952 times among them in a single session—the session of 1883. There are not half-a-dozen men of real eminence in the whole band of them. It is the crotcheteers, the self-seekers, the hot-headed men of one idea, who consume the public time. It is not sobriety of judgement, intelligence, and patriotism which regulate the discussions in the Lower House; it is party feeling, and selfish individualism, and personal vanity which run rampant in the House of Commons, and bring contempt upon the proceedings of Parliament. Is it the case that gusts of popular passion pass over the Lower House and leave it unaffected; or is it not the fact that calm and rational consideration—whether of policy or of legislation—is the exception; and hasty, slovenly, sometimes violent and impassioned measures—the result of outside agitation—the rule?

What is the chief complaint against the House of Commons? It is, that it is incapable of doing business in a business-like way. It is over-worked, and yet it is insatiable of work; its methods of procedure are antiquated, and yet it will not, or it cannot, amend them; it spends its time in unmeaning talk, and neglects the work which it has to do, or it does it at a time when calm consideration is impossible; it encourages, or at least it permits, the most insignificant and the most worthless of its members to consume its time, and, by obstructive tactics, to ruin its efficiency. And is there any probability that it will improve its methods and amend its conduct? 'As our system of representation,' said the Prime Minister in one of his Edinburgh speeches, 'becomes more popular, constituencies expect more from their members in the way of speaking; and there is a great addition—which I cannot complain of—there is a great addition in the bulk and number of speeches made on that account. These may be called a legitimate cause. But there is a very illegitimate cause, and that is that the deference, and I may say the reverence, with which fifty years ago every man entered that great assembly—the noblest deliberative assembly in the world—and the preparation of his mind to defer to the wish of that assembly as to the mode, time, and degree of his laying his opinions before it—that, gentlemen, has undergone a wonderful

'change.' Do we find that 'reverence for the noblest de-liberative assembly in the world,' and 'that preparation of mind to defer to the wish of the assembly as to the mode, time, and degree of laying opinions before it' increase as time goes on? The Prime Minister speaks of the attitude of mind with which members entered the House of Commons half a century ago. Can it be said that that attitude of mind remains? Must it not be admitted that the reverence for, and deference to, the wish of the assembly has, during the last three Parliaments, become a diminishing quantity? 'If you wish to make anything of yourself in this place,' said an old member to a newly-elected representative the other day—'if you wish to make anything of yourself you must discard the engaging diffidence of youth; you must consider yourself as good as the most experienced man in the place, and as capable of undertaking the biggest things as he is.' That is the spirit which actuates many of the representatives of the people's House. Each man is engaged in a struggle to make something, not of his country, but of himself; and he is encouraged to do so by his constituents, who feel a certain reflected glory in the something which their representative makes. Every man, even the youngest and most inexperienced, considers himself as good as any other man, and even better; and declines to show deference to, or respect for, age, or Parliamentary experience, or the authority of the House.

Such is, speaking generally, the character of the representative Chamber as at present constituted, and, as we have said, we see no probability of much improvement. Household suffrage in towns, though it has widened the basis and strengthened the operation of political power throughout the nation, has not improved the quality of the constituent elements of the people's House, nor has it enabled that House to do its work in workmanlike fashion. Whether the extension of household suffrage to the country will effect what household suffrage in the towns has failed to do remains to be seen; or, if that fails also, whether we shall attain to it by manhood or by universal suffrage. Be that as it may, the conclusion which we draw from these considerations is this: that we have not yet, at least, secured an ideal Chamber, and that it seems only too probable that a single Chamber elected by household or by manhood or by universal suffrage would resemble a French Convention, and would be dangerous to liberty, prosperity, and good government—perhaps even to political honesty and independence.

Having decided this question in the negative, we have

next to consider whether the hereditary House should continue, or whether a brand-new House of Notables is to be constituted, and if the latter, what is to be the nature of its constitution—is the hereditary element to be maintained? and, if so, in what proportion? Or if it is to be obliterated, is the new House to be nominated or elected, or partly nominated and partly elected, or is it to be partly hereditary, partly nominated, and partly elected? What are the main objections to an hereditary Upper Chamber such as the House of Lords? They are, put shortly, first, that it is not in sympathy with the people, and does not, and cannot, know what they want, or what they consider to be for the benefit of the nation; second, that it contains a large number of men who, by the accident of birth, are called upon to take a responsible part in the political life of the nation, but who have no aptitude or capacity for the work; third, that, consisting as it does almost exclusively of landowners, all questions are considered from the landlords' point of view, and are scrutinised from that point of view with something of the anxiety for the protection of class interests with which outside affairs are regarded by a body of trades' unionists; and fourth—and it is in this that the sting of the present agitation lies—that the influence and the power of the House are used, not for the good of the nation, but in the selfish interest of one party in the State; that, in short, the majority of the House of Lords has become a Conservative agency of the most powerful kind.

These are the four leading counts in the indictment against the House of Lords, but in all the tirades against the House of Lords with which we have become familiar of late, and even in the more temperate discussions on the subject, attention has been directed to one only of the functions of that assembly. Hostile critics fall foul of the House of Lords as regards their misdeeds in the matter of legislation only. They say—and this was the gist of Mr. Gladstone's veiled but suggestive attack—they say, 'See the number of Bills which this perverse body has delayed or thrown out during the last fifty years: Irish Municipal Reform delayed; Irish Land Bills postponed; Compensation for Disturbance Bills rejected; Jewish Disabilities thrown out ever so many times; Ballot Bill rejected; Franchise Bill effectually stopped. See, again, the number of Bills mutilated. Consider the necessity which active legislators experience in watering down their schemes so as suit the palate of the hereditary House.' These are, no doubt, serious charges; but, on the other hand, is the elective Chamber immaculate? Does party

spirit never enter in to prevent useful legislation from coming to maturity in that House? Take the Criminal Code Bill. That is a measure which could not fail to receive useful and valuable treatment at the hands of the Upper House. The weight of judicial and legal talent in the House of Lords would be brought to bear upon it, and would mould it into one of the grandest monuments of legislation; but it cannot pass the House of Commons. Party feeling and the jealousy of little men stop its way, and thus, by the action of the people's House, the nation is deprived of one of the greatest legislative boons which could be conferred upon it. To return, however, to the question before us. It is difficult to defend the action of the House of Lords in the matter of legislation. The charges are condemnatory of the House in the legislative capacity; but in that capacity it is most *en évidence* before the public, and its failure in this capacity gives most offence. The question which the student of political science should put to himself is, not how many Bills the House of Lords has delayed, or mutilated, or watered down, but whether it performs the functions of a Second Chamber, on the whole, reasonably well.

Now what are the functions of a Second Chamber? Mr. Rathbone, in his interesting pamphlet, which stands at the head of this article, says that, roughly speaking, the ends for which a Second Chamber should exist are these: (1) to check impulsive legislation; (2) to be a lasting guard against laws passed to satisfy an interested and active minority of the nation; (3) to assist the First Chamber in elaborating the details of measures. These he considers to be the ends for which a Second Chamber should exist. They are all three excellent ends, but in stating them Mr. Rathbone falls into the error to which we have alluded. He looks only at the legislative function of the Second Chamber. But in discussing the utility of the House of Lords the legislative function, though important, must not monopolise the whole attention. The judicial function of the House of Lords, while it enhances the dignity of that assembly, is perhaps an accident of the Constitution, and cannot be regarded as of necessity a function of a Second Chamber. But surely the function of independent criticism of the Executive is an important function, and that function the House of Lords discharges with conspicuous ability and impartiality and usefulness. There is again what, for want of a better expression, we may call the function of education, which the House of Lords, when it gives its mind to it, discharges fully as well as or even better than the House of Commons.

In the great debates in the House of Lords both sides of a question are stated with a freedom from party bias, and with an independence of tone which are rare indeed in the House of Commons. These debates have a higher educating influence on the country than the more partisan discussions in the Commons. They are read by the public with quite as much interest and with even greater advantage. They are full-dress debates in which the strong men are alone paraded, and in which the rank and file defer to their intellectual superiors in a manner unknown in the other House. There is always something to learn from a great debate in the House of Lords. In the Commons you know what every man will say before he says it; in the Lords there are always men of individual character and individual thought who look at the questions under discussion from an original point of view, and who give expression to their view in forcible and impressive language. In these several functions distinct from the legislative function, the House of Lords displays an unquestioned superiority. But in the statement of them the catalogue of services is not exhausted. For some years now the Select Committees of the House of Lords have commanded higher respect and inspired more confidence than those of the House of Commons. Enquiries have been conducted on social questions of difficulty and complexity (such, for instance, as the Committee, presided over by Lord Aberdare, upon Intemperance some years ago) by the House of Lords Committees with an ability, impartiality, consideration, and freedom from party bias, which they do not always receive from the busier, less independent, and more fully occupied House. In matters relating to Private Bill legislation—though we hope that ere long both Houses will be relieved from the arduous and unsatisfactory work connected with the existing system—the Railway and other Private Bill Committees of the House of Lords inspire (it may be owing to the more permanent character of the elements of which these Committees are composed) very much greater confidence than the Committees of the House of Commons. These are some of the claims to consideration which a defender of the House of Lords would put forward as extenuating circumstances; and certainly the statement of them shows that attention has been too exclusively fixed upon the one and most obvious function of legislation to the exclusion of the other functions which, though less showy, are in truth not less real and tangible.

But the best plea in mitigation of sentence is the difficulty of suggesting any substitute. If you abolish the House of Lords as a branch of the legislature, and still demand a Second Chamber, what will take its place? Various suggestions have been made—a few by men of eminence, many by men of little note. Nearly every man who speaks, and most of those who write, for abolition, have a Second Chamber in their pockets, or a plan for modifying the existing Chamber, or for lessening its power. Nothing in the whole controversy is so remarkable as the confident tone that many men of some public notoriety have adopted on the subject. Without apparently having given more than an afternoon's thought to the matter; without any sense of the grave responsibility they are taking on themselves; members of Parliament and men of education, to say nothing of the humbler folk among the hosts of writers and demonstrators, have laid down plans for a new cut-and-dried Constitution for the British Empire with the jaunty light-heartedness with which they would order their luncheon at a club. There are, however, some among them who have misgivings. Mr. Freeman, for instance, hesitates to formulate a scheme for a brand-new Constitution. He admits the difficulty and the magnitude of the questions involved, and owns that they cannot be settled in a hurry. He is 'inclined to think that at the present stage of things 'they would do best to make their demands as general as 'might be, that they would have some remedy for the present state of things, but would not commit themselves 'hastily to the form it should take.' This is a wise resolve, and one in which most men can concur. But let us glance at some of the schemes which have been suggested. Some one proposes a Second Chamber consisting mainly of Fellows of the Royal Society, Fellows of the Royal Academy, Fellows of the College of Surgeons, and Fellows of the leading colleges at the two universities, with two or three representatives of more popular institutions thrown in. This might be an excellent governing body for the Social Science Congress. But in the eyes of most men of the world an Upper Chamber consisting of men distinguished in the Church, in the law, in the naval and military services of the Crown, and in political life, even when combined with a large intermixture of fox-hunting and pigeon-shooting peers, would command as much respect as an assembly of men of science and literary men, combined with a large intermixture of painters, doctors, and college dons. Some one else suggests that the Ministry of the day should select a small Chamber out of the existing House of Lords which should form an

assembly in sympathy with the Lower House. There is more reason in this proposal. But what would be the value of such an assembly? It would be a Liberal House to-day, formed and brought together to register the measures and endorse the policy of Liberal Ministers. Who would pay the smallest attention to its performances and proceedings? To-morrow it would be a Conservative House, formed to do the same with the measures and policy of Conservative Ministers. There would, no doubt, be this advantage—that whereas, at present, the House of Lords performs this duty for the Conservatives alone, the Liberals would under the proposal have their turn. But, so long as faction and party spirit exercise the influence they now possess in this country, no Ministry could be trusted to call together an independent House. It is inconceivable that a selection from the House of Lords, nominated by the Ministry of the day, could ever be regarded as exercising strict impartiality or as possessing moral weight. Another suggestion has been made, to decimate the House of Lords—to allow every ten men in it to elect a representative, and to fill up the gaps partly by nominees of the Crown and partly by some undefined mode of popular election. This proposal has an air of plausibility in it. But the Crown nominees would be always regarded with suspicion, and the system of selecting representative peers which prevails at present in the case of the Scotch and Irish peerages is hardly so successful as to warrant any great extension of the principle. Somebody else suggests that any man who has been three times elected for the House of Commons should, under certain disabilities, be eligible for the House of Lords. Possibly this proposal was hardly serious. But if it was, the case of Mr. Bradlaugh is, perhaps, a sufficient security against its immediate adoption. Mr. Rathbone proposes an elaborate plan for the modification and improvement of the House of Lords, and whatever we may think of the crudity of the other plans, we give Mr. Rathbone full credit for the care and thought which he has bestowed upon the subject, and for the sense of responsibility which pervades every page of his important contribution to the controversy. His plan is, to form a Second Chamber by popular election from the whole body of the peers, through the agency of the House of Commons, and to combine with the peers so elected a number of life peers and law lords, and the chairmen of all the new County Boards whenever—it may not be till the Greek kalends—these County Boards have been established. But this plan has the disadvantage of combining novelty with complexity; and it has the further

disadvantage of constituting a Second Chamber which would inevitably be stronger than the first; though it could not, for many generations to come, command anything like the authority of an historic House.

This is the difficulty which meets us in all these new-fangled schemes. What is required is an assembly which has historical prestige and which contains the representatives of the best traditions of the country, of the property, the permanent interests, the higher intellectual life, and the social distinction of the community, without being a mere landlords' trades' union. You want the rich and leisured classes to take practical interest in the political life of the nation. As the democracy grows in strength, you want to keep the men of wealth and social distinction in close communion with the Administration. There is less danger of corruption and self-seeking in the classes which have all the good things of life, than in those which want to have them. The strength of the English Constitution, and the charm of public life, have to a large extent consisted in this—that politics has never become a trade; the professional politician is a weed that, up till now, has not taken root in England. The best men in the State have always been ready and willing to give the best of their lives to the service of the State; and anything which would turn these men away from public life—as they have been turned away in America, in France, and in some of our colonies, by the growth of political adventurers and professional politicians—would be a more serious and more permanent evil to the commonwealth than the occasional postponement of a popular measure, or the Conservative colouring which the action of the House of Lords has habitually given to legislation.

It is not difficult to see what we want; the difficulty is to find it. The House of Lords can remain constituted as it is at present, but with restricted powers; or it can be opened up so as to include a large infusion of life peers, ex-officials, ex-ministers, ex-diplomatists, and men of that stamp; and, at the same time, the House of Commons might be opened to such of the peers as may be willing to undertake the troubles of popular election and the labour and worry of House of Commons' life. By some such process as this, if the country should insist on change, both Houses might be materially strengthened. The Upper House would assume more the character of a Council of Elders, and would consist of men of experience in practical affairs, men well on in years, from whom the passions and illusions of youth had passed away, but who, from their assured position and their

independence of popular clamour, could look at questions and events with impartiality, and could say what they believe without fear or favour. Such an assembly would necessarily be conservative, not in the party sense but in the higher sense; because in it would be developed 'that cautious and critical frame of mind which leads to conservatism of the true kind, not obstructive but judicial, and which subjects new schemes to the clear light of reason aided by practical experience.' At the same time a House so constituted would not be eager for power; it would not set itself against the Lower House; it would not care to absorb more than its own appropriate influence in the affairs of the nation. The House of Commons, at the same time, by the infusion of the younger and more ambitious and more able among the peers to whom it would be open, would be improved and strengthened. That sort of leaven is, perhaps, more wanted at the present day than in former times; an infusion of the dull decorum of the gilded chamber might improve the conduct and temper the manners of the popular assembly.

But after considering all the schemes and all the proposals for modification or reform of the Upper House, which are as plentiful as the blackberries of this prolific season, we come back to this question: Can we get anything better than the existing House, with all its unpopularity and all its infirmities? We know that it is possible; for it is there, and has been there for something like six hundred years. We know that it is independent of popular clamour—and, perhaps, its independence adds to its unpopularity—and that it forms its own judgements; and, whether they be good judgements or bad judgements, it is something to have independent judgements. We know that as a court of revision it is not open to corruption, and that it is not accessible to social bribes; we know that, except in the matter of land—a very important exception, we admit—it is disinterested; and it has abundance of leisure to form a cool and dispassionate judgement upon the matters which come before it. 'The House of Lords,' as it has been well put, 'besides independence to revise judicially, and position to revise effectually, has leisure to revise intellectually. These are great merits; and, considering how difficult it is to get a good Second Chamber, and how much with our present First Chamber we need a Second, we may well be thankful for them.'

All these reformers of the House of Lords appear to forget that if they strengthen the Second Chamber by an infusion of a more popular element than the hereditary peerage they would create a more powerful and energetic check upon the

House of Commons than that which exists at present; and, consequently, that when the two branches of the Legislature happened to differ, the contest between them would be far more dangerous and severe. It may here be remarked that if the five hundred gentlemen who sit by descent in the House of Lords were unsupported out of doors, their privileges would avail them nothing; it is because the House of Lords is essentially representative that it exercises and retains its power. It represents, not numbers or local interests, but institutions—the Church, the law, the army, the navy, the civil and diplomatic services, the governors of colonies, the Viceroy of India. It represents the whole Conservative body in the United Kingdom, and, although the Conservative party may be, and we believe is, in a minority at the polling booths, it nevertheless comprises a powerful minority entitled to a voice in the affairs of the realm, and probably a considerable majority of those who by their station, their property, their culture, and their experience in public affairs, are at least entitled to be heard. That is the salt of the British Constitution; and if the sole power in the State is transferred to a numerical majority of the poorest and least educated classes of society, unchecked by any countervailing institution, the Constitution is overthrown. Personally, the power of the leading political members of the House of Lords would be increased by the abolition of that House; because the doors of the House of Commons (from which they are now excluded) would be thrown open to them, and, doubtless, at least forty or fifty of the peers would at the next election find seats there and displace an equal number of Commoners.

The chief failure of the House of Lords, and that which has caused the present outcry, is produced by bad leading. Sir T. Erskine May it is, we think, who says that ‘the House of Lords has generally yielded with an indolent facility to the domination of one or two of its own members gifted with the strongest wills.’ Lord Thurlow, Lord Eldon, the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Lyndhurst have each, at different times, ruled it with a rod of iron. In later times Lord Derby and Lord Beaconsfield played the Dictator; and now it has yielded itself to a man more dangerous and more reckless than any of these men, the Marquis of Salisbury. By him it has been worked as it was never worked before—not even by Lord Lyndhurst—exclusively in the interests of the Conservative party, to gain petty party advantages, to stop all Liberal legislation, and, if it were possible, to discredit Mr. Gladstone. This evil is increased by the vicious

mode of election of the representative peers of Scotland and Ireland, which is, in fact, by a *scrutin de liste*, throwing the whole power of nomination into the hands of the leader of the Tory party to the entire exclusion of the Liberal peers. The peers thus named, for there is no free election of them, do, in fact, constitute a large portion of the Tory majority in the House.

Twenty years ago the Lords, on their own initiative abolished the system of proxies. Perhaps that is not a great internal reform to point to as an index of a perception of imperfection. But it is something. Two years ago the majority refused to follow the headlong leading of their chief. That is another sign that there is some hesitation in the ranks. True, since then they have gone back a step when they declined with something like contempt the proposal of one of the most farseeing among them for the appointment of a Select Committee to consider the best means of promoting the efficiency of their House. That was a relapse into the dark ages of infallibility. But, unless and until we are undeceived in the approaching Session, we shall cling to the hope that this relapse is but temporary, and that the counsels of prudence and the true British spirit of compromise will prevail. The Duke of Wellington has furnished us with an apt precedent. 'Upon finding the difficulties,' he says, in his letter to Lord Derby in 1846, 'in which the late King William was involved by a promise made to create peers, the number, I believe, indefinite, I determined myself, and I prevailed upon others, the number very large, to be absent from the House in the discussion of the last stage of the Reform Bill, after the negotiations had failed for the formation of a new Administration. This course gave at the time great dissatisfaction to the Party; notwithstanding that, I believe it saved the existence of the House of Lords at the time, and the Constitution of the country.' It is perhaps too much to expect that Lord Salisbury will show the same judgement and generalship as the Duke of Wellington showed at that time. If there was any chance of that the present difficulties could not have arisen. But there is an army to be considered as well as a general—an army which has already left its general in the lurch. 'I am not at all sure,' said Lord Rosebery, in his speech on the second reading of the Bill, 'after the months which we are about to pass through before this Bill comes up again, that the army will not have melted away. Some will have listened to the dictates of reason; some will be satisfied with one rejection; some will have married wives and

‘bought oxen, and done the other things of which we are told in the Scripture.’ There will be a falling away; of that we may be certain. There will be ‘waverers’ now as in 1832. The only question is, will the number of these useful men be sufficient for the purpose? We believe it will. ‘The House of Lords,’ says Mr. Bagehot, in his *Essays on Parliamentary Reform*, ‘must yield whenever the opinion of the Commons is also the opinion of the nation, and when it is clear that the nation has made up its mind.’ If there ever was a question on which the mind of the nation was clearly made up, it is that the counties shall have the same franchise as the boroughs. There is not a handful of men in the three kingdoms that denies it. ‘My Lords,’ said Lord Granville, in 1869, ‘my Lords, you have power—great power, immense power—for good. But there is one power you have not. You have not, more than the House of Commons, more than the constitutional sovereigns of this country, more, I will add, than the despotic sovereigns of some great empires in civilised communities—you have not the power of thwarting the popular will when properly and constitutionally expressed.’ There are those who propose to give the House of Lords what is called a suspensory vote—that is, the power to throw out a measure only once which has passed the House of Commons. But the vote of the House of Lords is but a suspensory vote now, and the vote which they gave in July is suspensory. The wisest members even of the majority know that their House must yield if the people are determined. A Second Chamber, and especially a Chamber of hereditary magnates, cannot resist the people’s Chamber when it and the nation which creates it are in earnest. A body of five hundred men divided among themselves—nearly equally divided—however closely they may be hemmed in by privileges and by historical prestige, can no more stand up against an excited and determined nation than King Canute of old could stand up against the rolling waves of the Atlantic.

We assume, then, for the main purpose of this paper, that the House of Lords will give way in the autumn, that some rational terms of compromise will be proposed and accepted, and that the Franchise Bill will become law before the end of the year. But, just to work the problem out, let us assume that the House of Lords will continue obstinate and reject the Bill, or stop the progress of the Bill, in November as effectually as it stopped it in July. What in that case would be likely to happen as the result of such a course of action?

In this contingency three courses would be open to the Government. They might remain in office, encourage the agitation in the country, which would want but little to set it in a blaze, pass the Bill once more through the Commons, and give the Lords another chance. They might, on the other hand, prorogue Parliament, recommend a great creation of peers to swamp the Conservative majority in the Upper House, and, when they have got them, summon Parliament together again, and pass the Bill through both Houses. Or the third course open to them would be to follow the precedent of 1832, to resign office, and allow Lord Salisbury to form a Ministry if he could, and let him appeal to the country. Lord Salisbury has challenged the Government to take this course, and, while the two other courses are well within the limits of the Constitution, it may be that the third course is the proper one to follow. There is, indeed, a fourth course—that, namely, for which Lord Salisbury has been playing—an immediate dissolution. From a party point of view alone, as distinct from a national point of view, we are of opinion that this would have been a wise course if the Government had adopted it in July; but after the resolute tone which the Prime Minister has taken against what he has characterised as ‘treason to British liberty,’ the proposition, namely, that the House of Lords can force a dissolution, it is unlikely, though not impossible, that this course will be adopted.

The creation of peers is, strange to say, the proposal which seems to be received with favour by many of the most advanced among the Radicals. Why these gentlemen should wish to have sixty or a hundred able and influential men eliminated from the ranks of the commonalty and sent to recruit the ranks of the hereditary House passes our understanding; nevertheless it is so. But this proposal, though supported by precedent, is a rough instrument, and one that has been, and should be, sparingly used. Mr. Gladstone is the last man to wish to use it unnecessarily. It is, moreover, an unsatisfactory instrument. It is effectual *ad hoc*; or at least it was effectual *ad hoc* when it was last used. A creation on a small scale, however, was all that was necessary to swamp a majority in what in the time of Queen Anne was a small Upper House; and even then it was not so easy to provide the swamper. One, at least, to whom it was offered declined the office. ‘This looks,’ said Sir Miles Wharton, ‘like serving a turn. Peers used to be made for services which they have done, but I should be made for services that I am to do.’ It is probable that sixty or seventy gentle-

men sent to-day to the Upper House in order to pass a particular measure would pass it. But you cannot pledge these men, much less can you pledge their descendants, to support all the measures which go to the Upper House at the instance of a particular Government. You cannot pledge them to pass the supplementary measure for the distribution of seats unless they have seen it beforehand, and have agreed generally to the provisions contained in it. But if sixty or a hundred men have seen the measure why should not six hundred? Why should it not be public property? The stamp of man who is chosen to be promoted to the peerage is, oftener than not, a man who is inclined to think for himself, and who would refuse to sacrifice all future independence. 'A staunch Whig,' it has been said, 'raised to the Upper House is often found a doubting, critical, fastidious partisan; sometimes an absentee, and not unfrequently an opponent of his party.' All this has to be reckoned with when new creations on a large scale are urged. And if it was otherwise; if you could select a number of such thick-and-thin supporters as could be trusted to stand by their party in all predicaments, and to vote blindly for their measures on every occasion, would you not be offering a temptation to the other party, when they came into office, to recommend the creation of an equivalent number of their supporters to redress the balance? If a game of brag, with coronets for counters, become the pastime of opposing parties, the Radicals would have their way, and the hereditary House would die of repletion, and this may be the explanation of their manifest desire for a fresh creation. But there is another element to be considered in so grave and exceptional a course. The creation of peers is not a mere Ministerial act, it requires the direct assent of the Sovereign. King William IV. did at last give a reluctant and conditional authority to Earl Grey to create Peers in 1832 if the House of Lords continued to oppose an unbending resistance to the Reform Bill of that year; but this was *after a dissolution* of Parliament which had demonstrated the peremptory resolution of the country. We should imagine that if a creation of peers were proposed to the Queen, her Majesty would reply in perfectly constitutional terms, 'First try a dissolution, and then, if necessary, we will talk about peers.' We cannot think that this course will commend itself to the Government of the day; it appears to us to be the least probable of the three.

The first course might be effectual, but there are grave objections to it. In the first place the delay would render it

hardly possible to pass the Redistribution Bill during the present Parliament, and that would be a serious evil. Whatever happens, the whole Reform question ought to be dealt with by the same Parliament. It is convenient that it should be so, and it is desirable with a view to the expedition of public business. We do not urge this in the interest of the agricultural voters. The danger which looms so large in the eyes of Conservative writers and speakers, that the agricultural vote will be swamped by the labour vote if a general election should take place upon an extended franchise and without redistribution, appears to us to be quite imaginary. It is conceded on all sides that out of some 1,500,000 voters in England and Scotland—for we dismiss Ireland from consideration, as no human being can conjecture what half a million Irish voters may do—at least one half will be purely agricultural voters. They will be distributed over the rural constituencies, and these constituencies will have just the same proportional influence in the future that they have had in the past. The Conservatives in Parliament and outside have proclaimed that they are favourable to an extension of the suffrage and eager for redistribution. We are bound to take them at their word. And their eagerness for redistribution speaks something for their disinterestedness, because it is more than probable that the Conservative party will be stronger without a Redistribution Bill than with one. Of the new agricultural voters a large proportion, perhaps two-thirds, will vote Conservative. But any Redistribution Bill founded on a new electorate must almost inevitably tell against the Conservative party. It matters little by which side it is passed. It will be hardly possible to propose any alteration of the constituencies which will greatly help the Conservative party. They need have no fears of jerrymandering, because—to put it on the lowest ground—there is no temptation to the Liberals to play unfairly when they have all the honours in the pack. And the Liberals need not be afraid of the Conservatives manipulating the constituencies, because there is nothing which they could propose, with a chance of acceptance, which in the end would do their party much good. We can understand an honest Tory disliking the whole Reform movement and doing his utmost to defeat it. We cannot understand his anxiety for redistribution unless it be on the praiseworthy ground, which is also our ground, that it is of the first importance that the whole Reform scheme should be brought to maturity and be safely garnered by the same Parliament. In the best interests of the country it is essential that this matter should be finished and put out

of hand so that the regular business of the nation may be rightly carried on.

But it would be of evil precedent and subversive of all order and decorum in public or Parliamentary life for the Ministers of the Crown to head an agitation against one of the component parts of the Constitution. The Prime Minister has shown in an unmistakeable manner that he is alive to this. His tone and his method of dealing with the matter when he was in Edinburgh, left nothing to be desired. He, no doubt, was conscious of the strength of his cause, and, like a skilled whist-player, was not going to lead out his trumps when he wanted only the odd trick. But nevertheless, the temptation to say something which would gratify the excited audiences which he saw before him must have been very great to a man in whom the rhetorical sensibility is so keen. Mr. Gladstone deserves credit from all reasonable men for the restraint which he put upon himself in the matter. His example has been followed by Lord Hartington in the excellent speech recently delivered by him to a public meeting. Moderation is above all things desirable. It is the way to win, and it is the way to earn the respect and approval of intelligent men.

But the most serious of all the objections to the first course would be this—that the House of Lords might be so infatuated as to reject the Bill a third time. The sands of the Parliament of 1880 are running out, and Lord Salisbury may be reckless enough to incur all risks in order to secure the dissolution which he desires and a general election by the constituencies which he seems to think essential to the well-being, almost to the existence, of his party. But a third rejection would lead to consequences which we do not like to contemplate. Already the perverse action of Lord Salisbury and his majority has advanced the progress of the democracy by giant strides. We are to-day many stages nearer the reign of the multitude than we were in July. What Lord Salisbury would characterise as mob-rule is a full half-century closer to us than it was before he persuaded his two hundred followers to accompany him into the lobby. To many sound Liberals the rapid advance of the democracy may seem a matter for rejoicing rather than of regret. But we cannot imagine that the majority in the House of Lords or the Conservative party in the House of Commons or in the country can welcome the rapid and successful onslaught upon the privileges and power of the aristocratic order which Lord Salisbury has already brought upon it. If a second, and yet a third time, the House of Lords were to follow along the

dangerous track on which they have been started, it would lead them to their ruin.

If, then, it appears unlikely that Mr. Gladstone will propose a creation of peers, and if, to judge by his Edinburgh address, he will be opposed to an agitation against the House of Lords headed by the Ministers of the Crown, we are left face to face with the third course—namely, the resignation of Ministers and a general election at the instance of a Conservative administration. That course seems to be one which a constitutional Minister might follow, but we can conceive no solution more perilous to the Conservative party itself and to the peace of the country. The accession of a Tory Ministry to power in the present temper of the people would give the signal for violent agitation, and probably a crusade against the hereditary branch of the Legislature. All the sections of the Liberal party would be united in opposition, more than they are in power. For a time the extreme party might carry the constituencies with them by fomenting the hatred of the House of Lords which exists in the Radical constituencies. But the inevitable reaction would follow. The country, rent asunder by conflicting parties, would pass through an ordeal of the most harassing and distracting kind, which could not be settled this year, or next year, or for many years to come. The questions of franchise and redistribution, and the question of even greater importance, the internal reform of the House of Commons, would be lost in the turmoil. The business of the country would stand still until the two parties fought it out among themselves, or, it may be, until a new Cromwell arose who, with the acclamation of a wearied and disgusted nation, would prove by practical means that constitutional government in this country had had its day, and that a Lower Chamber which cannot do its work, and an Upper Chamber which will neither set its own house in order nor allow its partner to do the same good service to itself, are equally valueless.

These, however, are gloomy forebodings which we do not care to pursue. We have gone so far merely for the purpose of working out the problem as to what will happen if the House of Lords should continue in perversity. We trust that it will not do so. It is the interest of neither party to push matters to extremity. Hitherto, the spirit of compromise has been all-powerful in English politics, and has tided us over many greater difficulties than the one which confronts us to-day. There must be some give-and-take on both sides. The leaders of both parties have shown, by the marked moderation of their language, that they have had

enough of fighting, and wish to see this controversy settled. The door is not closed yet against all compromise. The Tory leaders, and many of their followers, know that they have gone to the extreme limit—that they have selected a fatal battlefield for themselves and for their order, and they wish to retire with honour. There is no desire on the part of the Liberal leaders to press their advantage to the last extremity. The Redistribution Bill, we are told, has been considered and prepared, and is far advanced towards completion. Indeed, at the last moment, as we close these pages, a document purporting to be the Draft Scheme of the Government in reference to Redistribution has been published by one of the leading London journals. We know not what degree of accuracy and authenticity is to be ascribed to this statement, but we cannot conceive that a scheme so elaborately prepared is a mere hoax, and we assume that some such plan is under the consideration of Her Majesty's Ministers. If that be the case, the sooner it is laid before Parliament the better. The opportune publication of the scheme of Redistribution would dispose at once of the immediate bone of contention between the Government and the Opposition, for it could no longer be said that the Franchise Bill is presented to Parliament whilst the all-important measure of Redistribution is still enveloped in secrecy and mystery. We see no reason to regret this publication, but the reverse. It ought materially to accelerate the settlement of the question. This scheme, if it bears any resemblance to the alleged draft of it, appears to us to be a large, just, and liberal measure, well calculated to ensure a fair and complete representation of the people. By the transfer of a large number of seats from small boroughs to the counties, divided into sections or wards, it enlarges in the best manner the basis of the constituencies; and it appears to us to rebut the imputation of manipulating the electoral body for party purposes. No doubt so vast and complicated a measure will be subjected to endless criticism; but we trust that criticism will not be governed solely by the narrow spirit of party, and that men of moderate opinions, whether on the Liberal or on the Conservative side, will accept a measure which yields no triumph to either faction and may terminate this great controversy.

INDEX.

A

Aristotle, his merits as a teacher of biology, 460—value of his scientific writings, 462—his zoological classification, 464—his account of the elephant, 466—of the camel, 467—his strange physiological notions, 467—his account of the halcyon, 472—of the partridge, 473—of the hoopoe, 474—curious stories about eagles, 474—song of the dying swan, 475—bears' cubs licked into shape, 476—other curiosities of zoological literature, 477—his scant knowledge of anatomy, 479—his neglect to verify his theories, 481—origin of the unicorn, 482—his depreciation of Ctesias, 483—his opinion of Herodotus, 483—his accurate description of marine animals, 485—his love of nature, 487—his true position as a writer on natural history, 488.

B

Bach, Johann Sebastian, review of Dr. Spitta's Life of, 225—a singular musical pedigree, 228—notice of the Bach family, 229—early life of Sebastian, 232—influence of the organ on his style, 234—cited by the Arnstadt New Church Consistory for eccentricities in accompanying the psalm-tunes, 238—his treatment of the organ at the Mülhausen Blasius-Kirche, 240—critical remarks on his compositions, 241—his organ music, 242—the 'Wohltemperirte Klavier,' 246—his choral music, 249—his want of dramatising instinct, 250—his inferiority to Handel in vocal solos, 251—general estimate of Bach's genius and works, 253.

Bartholomy-Saint-Hilaire, his translation of Aristotle's 'History of Animals' reviewed, 460.

Boulger, Demetrius C., his History of China reviewed, 525.

C

Catharine of Aragon, additional volumes by Mr. Gairdner on the divorce of, 89—dismissal of the queen from court, 91—the pope's breves, 92—Henry VIII. marries Anne Boleyn, 92—proceedings of Cranmer, 96—stormy interview of Chapuys with Henry, 97—expectations of war between Charles V. and Henry, 97—the mock trial at Dunstable, 98—pacific attitude of the emperor, 99—signs of wavering in Henry, 101—mission of the Bishop of Paris to Rome, 103—new *liaison* of Henry, 105—progress of the affair at Rome, 106—declaration of the pope's sentence, 108—effect produced in England, 109—apprehensions of an insurrection: remarkable letter from a Spanish consul, 110—Cromwell's scheme of ecclesiastical confiscation, 114.

China, review of Mr. Boulger's history of, 525—Chinese pretensions incompatible with universal right, 525—efforts to obtain equal rights for foreigners at Canton, 528—causes of the so-called 'opium war,' 529—ports opened to trade, 531—the second Chinese War, 532—concessions resulting from the War, 532—the Taeping rebellion, 535—national character of the Chinese, 535—reasons of their isolation, 539—problem of the future of China, 540—French relations with China and Tonking, 541—imperfect state of war, 543—attitude of the Chinese, 544.

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., his 'Life of Mountstuart Elphinstone' reviewed, 116.

Congo River, review of works relating to the, by Mr. H. H. Johnston and other authors, 151—the International African Association of Belgium, 152—volume of outflow of the river, 155—first discovery, 156—Dr. Livingstone's mistake, 157—vegetation and animal life along the river, 159—cataracts, 161—difficulties of travelling along its shores, 162—Stanley Pool, 163—climate, 164—natural productions and commercial capabilities, 165—manners and customs of the people, 168—Stanley's journey up the river, 172—Count de Brazza's rival expedition, 173—Leopoldville, 175—Stanley forestalls de Brazza in the Kuilu valley, 177—altered character of the Belgian Association, 177—the question of British interests on the Congo, 180—anarchical condition of the Lower Congo region, 181—the British treaty with Portugal, 184.

Croker, J. Wilson, his edition of Pope reviewed, 295.

D

Ditmarsch dialect, review of Klaus Groth's poems in, and letters on the, 377—the poet's birthplace, 378—his education, 379—Low-German dialect, 381—High-German, 382—'Family Scenes,' 388—'Idylls,' 390.

E

Elphinstone, Hon. Mountstuart, Sir E. T. Colebrooke's Life of, 116—Indian politics at the close of the last century, 116—a journey to Hyderabad, 117—description of Major Kirkpatrick, the Resident, 118—Maratha war, 119—battle of Assaye, 120—picture of camp life, 122—storming of Gawilgurb, 123—appointed Resident at Nagpore, 124—his journal, 125—interview with Lord Minto, 127—camp of Sindia, 128—views on the Afghan question, 130—appointed Resident at Poona, 132—character of the Peshwa's government, 133—necessity of consolidating British power, 135—downfall of the Peshwa, 136—a forecast of the Sepoy mutiny, 138—his government of Bombay, 140—impressions of England on returning home, 145—meets the Duke of Wellington at a dinner, 146—attends the debates on the Irish Disturbance Bill, 146—refuses the Governor-generalship, 147—his unfinished History of India, 148.

F

Fraser, Dr. W., his 'Chiefs of Grant' reviewed, 63.

G

Gairdner, James, his catalogue of State Papers relating to the divorce of Catharine of Aragon reviewed, 89.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., his speeches at Edinburgh, 566.

Grant family, review of Mr. Fraser's history of the, 63—genealogical investigations, 64—possessions of the family in Strathspey, 67—Lady Lillias Murray, wife of John Grant, fifth laird of Freuchie, 68—notice of her by Taylor the Water Poet, 69—her poems, 70—her son Sir John Grant and his lawsuits, 70—a journey to Edinburgh, 71—a document touching the raid of Gilliechrist, 73—James Grant, seventh laird of Freuchie, 74—the Scottish aristocracy of the seventeenth century, 76—Ludovick Grant, first laird of Grant, 77—Simon Lord Lovat's correspondence, 78—his courtship and marriage of Ludovick's daughter, 81—Brigadier Grant cashiered, 84—acquisition of the earldom of Seafield by the Grant, 85—account of the election of a Scotch parish minister in 1547, 86—the wadset land-tenure, 87—the tack, or lease, 88.

Groth, Klaus, review of his poems and of his letters on the German dialects, 377.

H

Heffter, A. G., his work on International Law reviewed, 251.

Hickson, Mary, her work on the Irish Massacres reviewed, 490.

House of Lords, reform of, 573—Its value as a Second Chamber, 583

I

International Law, review of Herr Heffter's treatise on, 251—the question of completely exempting all private property from capture at sea, 257—laws relating to prizes, 261—recaptures, 262—destruction of hostile captures, 262—blockades, 263—the problem of what constitutes contraband, 266—guerillas and francs-tireurs, 268—privateering, 269—prohibited agents of destruction, 270—employment of savage allies, 270—care of an enemy's sick and wounded, 271—violation of parole, 271—confiscation of an enemy's debts, 272—pacific blockades, 273—requisitions, 274—what kinds of property should be exempt from confiscation, 275—rights of neutrals, 276—equipment by neutrals of belligerent ships, 278—an American repudiation of the Three Rules, 279—the slave trade, 280—emigration to foreign countries, 282—extradition, 283—diplomatic privileges, 285.

Irish Massacres, review of Miss Hickson's work on the, 490—causes of misfortunes of Ireland, 490—rebellion of 1641, 491—Mr. Froude's remarks on the evidence, 492—Curry's history and Hallam's opinion of it, 493—conflicting accounts, 494—contemporary evidence, 495—the Ulster Plantation, 495—causes of the insurrection religious rather than agrarian, 497—depositions of witnesses, 500—Ranke on the motives of the massacres, 515—extent of the slaughter, 517—retribution, 518—Cromwell's avenging campaign, 519—inquiry before civil tribunals, 521—confiscation in three provinces, 522—lasting evils of the civil war, 523.

J

Johnston, H. H., his work on the river Congo reviewed, 151.

L

Lefèvre-Pontalis, M., his Life of John de Witt reviewed, 424.

Lightning conductors, review of works relating to, 32—early investigations of Franklin, 32—the kite experiment, 35—effects of the lightning on one of his rods, 36—Gay-Lussac's report, 37—M. Pouillet's reports, 39—Snow Harris's plan for protecting ships, 42—Professor Melsens's multiple-rod system as carried out at the Brussels Hôtel de Ville, 43—the Meteorological Society's Lightning-rod Committee, 46—report of the London Conference, 47—influence of length on the efficacy of conductors, 48—conductivity of galvanised iron, 49—testimonies to M. Melsens's system, 51—Colonel Parnell's retrograde scheme, 52—the accident to the spire of Chichester Cathedral, 53—inefficient lightning-rods, 55—duty of an electrical engineer, 56—necessity of good earth-contact, 57—examples of accidents with gaspipes, 58—danger from telegraph and telephone wires, 60—testing by the differential galvanometer, 62.

M

Malmesbury, Earl of, review of his memoirs, 393—his connexion with the Derby administration, 394—introduced to Queen Hortense and Louis Napoleon, 395—his political career, 395—his family connexions, 397—his life in the Highlands, 398—visits Louis Napoleon at Ham, 399—advocates Protection, 402—his conduct of foreign affairs, 406—dines at the Tuileries, 421—visits the ex-Emperor of the French at Chislehurst, 422—his views on the Second Empire, 423.

Maurice, Frederick Denison, contrasted with Arthur Stanley, 190—condition of his mind on taking orders in the English Church, 193—his views on subscription, 195—disappoints the High Church party, 196—his misconception of the Liberal party as being anti-theological, 197—why the clergy fail to influence the masses, 201—influence of his teaching on the Oxford movement, 204—his assumptions with regard to the historical books of Scripture, 205—want of sympathy with Dean Stanley's historical method, 208—strange use of terms, 210—controversial peculiarities, 211—his defence of the Athanasian Creed, 212—the controversy with Mr. Mansel, 214—his scheme of Christian socialism, 218—his one work in life, 222—his character, 223.

Merivale family, Memorials of the, by Miss Merivale, 545—origin of the name, 557—John Henry Merivale, 546—Samuel Merivale, 547—leaves the Baptists and becomes a Presbyterian, 548—his Unitarian leanings, 548—his 'plain living and high thinking,' 550—marries a lady of fortune, 551—diversity of his literary tastes, 553—John Merivale, 554—his disinclination for the ministry, 554—succeeds to a fortune, 554—his wife's relatives, the Katenkamp family, 554—political principles of the Merivales, 559—Mr. John

Merivale's political connexions, 561—Mr. Herman Merivale, 563—Lord Lytton's eulogy of his attainments, 565.

Mountain Observatories, 351—the 'Lick Observatory,' United States, 353—Peak of Teneriffe, 357—Guajara, 357—Calton Hill, Edinburgh, 357—Sherman, United States, 362—Mount Whitney, Sierra Nevada, 363—Mount Etna, 368—Pic du Midi observatory, Pyrenees, 370—La Paz, Bolivia, 371—Puno, Andes, 372—Lake Titicaca, 373—Vincocaya, 375—Ben Nevis, 375—Pike's Peak, Colorado, 376.

P

Pope, Alexander, Works of, 295—his detractors and admirers, 295—Sainte-Beuve's sympathetic estimate of him, 296—Pope's editors, 296—Macaulay's view of Pope's character, 298—Mr. Courthope's estimate, 298—Pope's poetical characteristics, 300—his claim to correctness of style, 301—his biographers, 303—his birth and parentage, 303—his childhood, 304—his education, 305—the 'Ode to Solitude,' 306—his earliest patron, 307—his Catholic connexions, 307—the 'Pastorals,' 309—the 'Essay on Criticism,' 311—'Windsor Forest,' 313—the 'Rape of the Lock,' 314—'Eloisa to Abelard,' 320—his translation of Homer, 322—his circle of friends, 324—Caryll's collection of Pope's correspondence, 327—the 'Dunciad,' 333—the 'Essay on Man,' 336—the 'Moral Essays,' 339—the 'Horatian Imitations,' 345—his party spirit, 349—his death, 350—his character, 350.

R

Reform, Parliamentary, present position of the question, 566—changes in our Parliamentary institutions in the past fifty years, 568—danger of coercive demonstrations, 569—recent exhibitions of feeling against the House of Lords, 571—the question of the necessity of an hereditary chamber, 573—can we govern with a single chamber? 575—nature of the charges against the Lords, 581—functions of a Second Chamber, 582—difficulty of suggesting any substitute for the House of Lords, 584—reforms in the Upper House, 589—courses open to the Government on the Reform question, 591.

S

Spitta, Dr. Philip, his life of Bach reviewed, 225.

V

Vitrolles, Baron de, Memoirs of, 1—accepts marks of distinction and favour from Napoleon, 4—joins Talleyrand's conspiracy, 5—violent scene between the Emperor and Talleyrand, 6—De Vitrolles' mission to the allied camp, 7—Count Stadion's view of the military situation contrasted with Napoleon's, 8—the allies reluctant to break with Napoleon, 10—De Vitrolles' personal sketches, 12—conference on the restoration of the Bourbons, 13—battle of Arcis-sur-Aube, 15—march of the allies on Paris, 16—Napoleon's generalship and diplomacy, 17—insincerity of his negotiations, 18—De Vitrolles' conversations with the Comte d'Artois, 19—the Comte's story of

Talleyrand's treachery to his master at Erfurt, 21—the Abbé de Pradt's strategic knowledge, 23—De Vitrolles despatched by the Comte to Paris with full powers, 23—combats the hesitancy of the allies, 25—Talleyrand's offer to Louis XVI., 27—appearance of France in the localities of the war, 28—the Senate demands the signature of the Constitution, 29—public entry of the Comte into Paris, 30—behaviour of the imperial marshals on the occasion, 31.

W

Witt, John de, review of works on his Life and Administration by M. Lefèvre-Pontalis and James Geddes, 424—birthplace and parentage, 425—tour through France and England, 425—practises law at the Hague, 426—appointed Pensionary of Dordrecht, 430—takes a prominent position in the government, 439—his desire for peace, 439—becomes Grand Pensionary of Holland, 441—conspiracy against him, 444—his financial reforms, 444—his foreign policy, 446—negotiates a peace with England, 450—concludes a treaty of alliance with England, 452—accession of Sweden to the Treaty, 453—French conquests checked by the Triple Alliance, 454—Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 455—unpopularity of De Witt, 458—attacked by assassins and left for dead, 458—his tragical end, 459.

END OF VOL. CLX.

